3 1761 07332636 5

NATIONALITIES AND SUBJECT RACES

Presented to the

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

by the

ONTARIO LEGISLATIVE
LIBRARY

1980

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto

http://www.archive.org/details/nationalitiessub00conf

2-4-10

NATIONALITIES AND SUBJECT RACES

Legislative Library
DISCARDED
Ontario
Dept.

Report of CONFERENCE

Held in Caxton Hall, Westminster
June 28-30, 1910

EGYPT - - Mahomed Farid and Taha el Abd
FINLAND - Aino Malmberg and Rosalind Travers
GEORGIA - Michel Tseretheli and W. Tcherkesoff
INDIA - - Lajpat Rai and B. Chandra Pal, H. Cotton, Dube
IRELAND - William Gibson and G. Gavan Duffy
MOROCCO - Henry W. Nevinson
PERSIA - - Bernard Temple
POLAND - W. Lack-Szyrma

SLAVERY AND FORCED AND INDENTURED LABOUR IN AFRICA, MEXICO, PERU, Etc. Charles Wentworth Dilke, H. Van Kol, René Claparède, Travers Buxton, E. B. Morel, J. J. Harris

PROPOSED REMEDIES. J. A. Hobson, G. K. Chesterton, S. H. Swinny, V. Rutherford, R. Cunninghame Graham, J. F. Green, B. Chandra Pal, A. J. Windus, F. C. Mackarness, Gilbert Murray, Arthur Ponsonby.

"If we fail to denounce the crime we become participators in it."

Charles Wentworth Dilke

Legislative Library
Ontario
Dept.

London:
P. S. King & Son
Orchard House, Westminster, S.W.

LIBRARY
DEC
19
1980
OF TORONTO
RSITY
HT
1505
C6
1910

CONTENTS

		PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTE		v.
PREFACE ON NATIONALISM AND NATIONALITY ...	Robert Lynd	vii.

FIRST SESSION

CHAIRMAN	F. C. Mackarness	1
EMPIRE AND SUBJECT RACES	Gilbert Murray	3
EGYPT'S DEMAND	Mohamed Farid	11
(TRANSLATION)		155
PRESENT CONDITION OF INDIA	Lajpat Rai	20
MOROCCO	H. W. Nevinson	41

SECOND SESSION

CHAIRMAN	Arthur Ponsonby	49
RIGHTS OF FINLAND...	Aino Malmberg	51
SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF FINLAND ...	Rosalind Travers	57
PERSIA'S EXTREMITY...	Bernard Temple	62
RIGHTS OF GEORGIA	Michel Tzeretheli	74
(TRANSLATION)		164
RUSSIAN MISRULE IN GEORGIA ...	W. Tcherkesoff	78

THIRD SESSION

CHAIRMAN	B. Cunninghame Graham	85
IRELAND'S GREATEST NEED	William Gibson	87
IMPERIALISM IN IRELAND	G. Gavan Duffy	89
POLAND	W. Lack-Szyrma	91

FOURTH SESSION

CHAIRMAN	Charles Wentworth Dilke	99
FORCED AND INDENTURED LABOUR		
COLOURED RACES UNDER WHITE MAN ...	H. Van Kol	107

PAGE

ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT ... ...René Claparède 111
(TRANSLATION) 172
PRESENT DAY SLAVERY ... ... Travers Buxton 114
" " ... ... E. B. Morel 116
" " ... ... J. H. Harris
" " ... ... Keir Hardie

FIFTH SESSION

CHAIRMAN ... ... J. A. Hobson
PROPOSED REMEDIES... 117
" " ... ... G. K. Chesterton 126
" " ... ... S. H. Swinny 130
" " ... ... V. Rutherford 134
" " ... ... B. Chandra Pal 137
" " ... ... Taha el Abd 141
" " ... ... R. B. Cunninghame Graham 142
" " ... ... J. F. Green 146
" " ... ... R. Claparède 148
" " ... ... A. J. Windus 149

APPENDIX

TRANSLATION 155
" 164
GEORGIAN PETITION... 166
OBJECT OF COMMITTEE ... ... S. H. Swinny 175
FINANCIAL STATEMENT 177
AUDIT 178

EDITORIAL NOTE.

Since the holding of the Conference, the first of its kind, which has given rise to this volume, two events occurred that must be noted.

The lamented death of Sir Charles Dilke took place in January after some months of ill-health, and prevented the revision of his paper on "Forced and Indentured Labour," printed here from the rough notes he used in his address to the Conference. That the paper begins and ends somewhat abruptly will, however, be forgotten by the reader in the interest and importance of the matter it contains, set out, as it is, with that fullness and precision of information always characteristic of the great statesman the world has lost in him.

In espousing the cause of those obscure peoples, for whose welfare so few care, and upon whom for long centuries the most cruel wrongs have been inflicted by men claiming to belong to higher races, Sir Charles Dilke was probing to its roots the canker of modern civilisation. He has helped to make some of us realise that we must neither accept the amenities of modern life unquestioningly, nor, having found the sources tainted, remain smugly quiescent in the enjoyment of them.

The second event to which it is necessary to allude is the imprisonment in Cairo of the Egyptian Nationalists' leader, Mohamed Bey Farid, for having written

a preface to a volume of patriotic verse. Farid Bey's manly appeal to the English people to do the right thing in Egypt will be read with redoubled interest by those who know that he is in prison, because he chose to tread the thorny path of emancipation and reform. But as we confidently look forward to the time when it will be impossible for any people claiming to be civilised to use, or allow to be used for their benefit, such hideous means of acquiring power and riches as are hinted at in Sir Charles Dilke's paper, so, also, we look forward confidently to the time when such condemnations as Farid Bey's will be impossible within the jurisdiction of any people claiming to be free.

N. F. Dryhurst.

March, 1911.

PREFACE

ON NATIONALISM AND NATIONALITY

The idea of Nationalism is one of the most generally misunderstood in the modern world. The Imperialists do not even try to understand it: they simply call it sedition and hand it over to the police. Unfortunately, a great number of excellent democrats—Socialists and humanitarians especially—are also hostile to the national idea. They regard it as an aggressive denial of the brotherhood of man, a shrill and immoral exaggeration of individualism. Perhaps this is because Nationalism means so many different things in different countries. In Russia, for instance, Nationalism has come to mean Chauvinism—the very reverse of the real meaning of the word. Nationalists of the Russian sort are essentially Imperialists or Supernationalists—perverters of the decent things in patriotism. You may always take it that a Nationalist who shows signs of Chauvinism is an Imperialist in the making. By his Chauvinism he has already betrayed the central principle of Nationalism, which is to respect the personality of every other nation as one wishes the personality of one's own nation to be respected. Therefore, when one speaks of Nationalism as a political theory and not as a meaningless catchword of party politics, one is thinking of Nationalism like Mazzini's—the Nationalism which urges countries like Finland, Persia, India, Poland, Egypt, Georgia, and

Ireland to strive, not for mastery over other nations, but for an equal place in an international brotherhood of free peoples.

Nationalism, then, is a theory concerning the personality of nations. Nationality, said Mazzini, is the individuality of peoples, and Nationalism is simply an assertion of the belief that the individuality of a people is as holy and real and desirable a thing as the individuality of a man or a woman. It holds up the ideal of a many-coloured cosmopolitanism of free nations as opposed to a colourless and mechanical cosmopolitanism of big Powers and subject races. The most cosmopolitan of creeds, it is eternally opposed to the pseudo-cosmopolitanism which means denationalisation—the sort of cosmopolitanism which is referred to in a famous passage in "Rudin," where Turgenev, speaking through one of his characters, says: "Cosmopolitanism is all twaddle, the cosmopolitan is a nonentity—worse than a nonentity: without nationality is no art, nor truth, nor life, nor anything. You cannot even have an ideal face without individual expression; only a vulgar face can be devoid of it." In the eyes of Nationalists, Imperialism makes for the vulgarisation, the spiritual lifelessness, of the world. Nationalism, on the other hand, aims at opening up a way by which the nations may live more abundantly.

It might be possible to admit a good deal of this and yet be unable to put the Nationalist theory into practical application. Some people seem to find it curiously difficult to tell a nation when they see one. They do not know whether Georgia is a nation or only part of Russia, whether Ireland is a nation or only a province of what the lawyers call the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. If Ireland is a nation, they say, for example, then why not Yorkshire? Is the individuality of Ireland any more marked or more manly than the individuality of Yorkshire? These are fair questions. The answer to them is that Yorkshire will

be a nation on the same day on which she feels that she is one, and on which her consciousness becomes so separate from the national consciousness of England that she will desire to express it in a distinct literature, language, social and political life, and all the rest of it. Ireland simply has a different national consciousness from England. Her very dissensions which she herself finds so absorbingly interesting only bore England. Even the dullest person can see that she has a distinct personality of her own to the making of which thousands of years have contributed—years of social and political change, of geographic isolation, of sun and wind and rain falling upon green growing things—thousands of years of the spirit of place working among men and women and creating an inheritance of personality and sentiment for the children of even the latest comers to the land.

Take the case of India again. Imperialists tell us of India, as Metternich used to say of Italy, that it is a mere "geographical expression." Thousands of authentic Indian voices, on the other hand, rise in every corner of the country to call India their motherland—in other words, to prove in the most effectual way possible that India is a unit of national consciousness. Indian Nationalism is an obvious fact to everybody except the people who think they can explain away all the great events from the Flood downwards by saying that they are the work of paid agitators; and the reality of Indian Nationalism is sufficient proof of the reality of the Indian nation. It is, of course, part of an unscrupulous Imperialist policy to deny the Indian nation—to say to the Indians, "You are divided into Hindu and Mahometan, into Mahratta and Punjaubee, into all sorts of races and religions. It is your want of unity which compels England to go in and manage your affairs for you. You would only quarrel and kill each other if you were left to yourselves." One would set more store by the conclusion of the Imperialist if one did not

know that with him the wish is here father to the thought. "Divide that you may govern," is an old settled principle of Imperial policy, and subject peoples are only kept subject by a constant excitement of all their worst passions in a way that recalls the degradations, without the heroisms, of civil war. "But the worst of this is," said Archbishop Boulter, Protestant Primate of Ireland, concerning a certain Irish movement in the eighteenth century, "that it tends to unite Protestant with Papist, and whenever that happens good-bye to the English interest in Ireland for ever." In other words, in order to further an Imperial policy, Ireland was to be kept, like India, "a geographical expression," a scene of civil hatreds, and to be prevented by hook or by crook from becoming a nation, in which men of opposite creeds would agree to differ and would collaborate on common days in striving for the honour and welfare of their country. Imperialism is surely the meanest and least scrupulous policy that ever deluded thousands of decent men and women into enthusiasm.

One may meet the Imperialist halfway, however, and admit to some extent the "geographical expression" argument. Grant, for instance, that Italy was once a "geographical expression." The question that immediately arises is: "Does the Imperialist hold it would have been better for Italy to have remained so and never to have awakened into free nationhood?" If he thinks that it is better to be a geographical expression than a free nation, why does he (supposing, for instance, he is an Englishman) recoil from the thought of the subjection of England by some foreign Power? And, if it is better to be a nation than a geographical expression, then surely he is bound to aid Poland, India, Persia, Egypt, Ireland, and all other trammelled peoples, as far as in him lies, in their struggle for a place among the free nations. Every nation begins by being a geographical expression. Nationalism is always a movement,

first, to give the geographical expression a soul, and, next, to give the soul a chance of expressing the best and most vital that is in it. The only condition upon which we can have what Mazzini finely called the "Holy Alliance of the Peoples" is that all the peoples shall be free and equal, each living according to its own conscience and its own idea of civilisation.

In order to live according to its own conscience, a nation has often to rid itself of foreign domination in its government, or in its finance, or in its industries, or in its intellectual life; for a foreign tyranny is usually more deadening to the soul of a people than even the worst home tyranny. Thus, Nationalism is in one respect a protest against the domination of foreigners: which seems to many people to be a narrow business. Nationalism, on the other hand, is equally a protest against the subjection of foreigners: it is as wide and humane as the hatred of slavery. It stands for universal rights, and makes for understanding, not misunderstanding, between nation and nation, for the nations can only speak to each other with understanding when each is free and respects the freedom of its neighbour. Thus, Nationalism is the necessary complement of Internationalism in any true sense. Either without the other becomes perverted and inhuman, and is a denial of great spiritual principles. The true Nationalist is he who aims at universal peace and brotherhood through universal liberty. He therefore believes that the dominant peoples stand to gain no less than the subject peoples from the spread of the national idea. He holds that if, for instance, the English nation were substituted for the British Empire, there would be fewer possibilities of dishonourable wars, and that the English people would make for themselves a fuller, freer, more pleasant and characteristic civilisation. That, however, is a point upon which I have no time just now to dwell. Mr. Chesterton is one of the few writers who have stressed this very necessary side of the Nationalist

theory. Perhaps he will one day give us a book on the excellence—or, as he himself might say, the jolliness—of Nationalism as a political principle.

ROBERT LYND.

NATIONALITIES AND SUBJECT RACES

First Session

Egypt—India—Morocco

A three days' conference on the defence of nationalities and subject races was opened on Tuesday (June 28th, 1910), at Caxton Hall, Westminster. Representatives of India, Egypt, Morocco, Finland, Georgia, Persia, Poland, and Ireland were present. Letters of apology were read from the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Lee Hicks), Sir William Wedderburn, and Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P. The chair was taken by Mr. F. C. Mackarness.

The Chairman said that they were met under the auspices of the International Committee, formed in 1907, to define and assist the rights of subject nationalities, and to introduce into international politics the principle recognised in private life that it was the duty of the strong to protect, and help the progress of the weaker and younger communities towards maturity. He was aware that in their work they would be brought into conflict with the great dominant aggressive principle in modern politics known as Imperialism. Imperialism concerned itself not at all with respect for the rights of small nations, but far more with nervously piling up great armaments against every conceivable friend or enemy from the German Emperor down to the Mad Mullah. It was not easy to be always certain of which of these two Potentates the modern Imperialist was most afraid.

The rise and progress of modern Imperialism first dated from the tenure of office of Mr. Disraeli, and it had been marked by a succession of wars upon small nations, both in Asia and in Africa, culminating in that stupendous catastrophe, the South African War. There were signs all round that the movement was preparing itself for a further advance, by fixing upon the British the curse of compulsory military service. He had therefore no hesitation in saying that not only for our own subject races in which they were interested, but for our own people, Imperialism was the enemy.

He greatly wished their President, Professor Leonard Hobhouse, could have been with them that evening to expatiate upon the subject, because he would have been able to speak to them with all the weight of acknowledged authority. When, two years ago, Lord Morley wrote an essay on Mr. Hobhouse's book "Democracy and Reaction," he expressed the hope that Professor Hobhouse would be preserved to write still further against the "spurious Imperialism of to-day."

They had, in the course of this Conference, a very large number of countries to discuss, as well as the conditions of compulsory labour in various parts of the world, but that evening they were going to discuss India and Egypt. The affairs in both these countries were burning questions at that moment, and they were extremely fortunate in having such distinguished gentlemen as Lala Lajpat Rai and Mohamed Bey Farid to address them.

EMPIRE AND SUBJECT RACES*

Opening Address by Professor Gilbert Murray

I should first say a few words on the nature and aims of this Conference. We are not debating whether there ought to be any subject races or ruling races. We accept the facts. Much less are we meeting to attack the Government. I will tell you what the Conference reminds me of. Two friends of mine who are Governors of large provinces in the East, one in Beluchistan and one in New Guinea, both happen to have told me of a custom they have introduced in order to get better into touch with their subjects. The Governor, every Sunday morning, goes on to his veranda and sits in an easy-chair reading a newspaper. If necessary he pretends to go to asleep. No officials are anywhere near him. And then any natives who have anything special to say, any unexplained trouble about which they feel shy or puzzled, come to the veranda and talk to him.

I do not pretend to carry the analogy very far. But our object is, in some rough way, to try and hear from members of various subject races and oppressed nationalities, especially those who are not allowed to speak in their own countries, something of what they suffer and what they desire, and what they have to say in criticism of their governments.

Now in these questions we English occupy a special position. In most cases, though not all, it is we ourselves who are the governing race, the heroes or the villains of the piece. That is to say, for this particular

* This address has already been printed in *The Sociological Review*.

occasion we must regard our Empire in a spirit of self-criticism, not in a spirit of glorification. We come to hear grievances, to consider what errors we have committed, to think of mending the faulty points of our Empire, not of boasting and rejoicing in the good points. It will be said, I know, that as far as the speakers at this Conference go, that is what they are always doing; they are always attacking the Empire and never praising it. As to that, I will only say that, if people in general were a little more ready to be occasionally and moderately critical, then we should not have to be incessantly and wearisomely so. If this nation is to do its work well, some self-criticism is absolutely necessary. We must not cavil, we must not be ungenerous to the errors of men, often great men, hard pressed in difficult places. But if a spirit of excessive criticism is dangerous to an empire, I think any study of history will show us that empires are subject to another disease, fully as dangerous and a thousand times more common, the disease of violence and vainglory, the disease of always siding with your own friends and preferring national pride to justice.

If you consider the work done in the world by any Imperial Power such as ourselves, you will of course find both good and evil. First, we generally establish peace, strong government, and social order: the first fundamental goods, on which all social progress must be based. Next, when in contact with lower races, we generally try to educate them, however scrappily and imperfectly, towards higher standards. If we fail to do that we fail in everything. I am not forgetting the dangers and the failures of this process; but allowing for all that, I venture to suggest that if, from the great story of human progress, you were to blot out all that has come to various peoples from contact—and compulsory contact—with higher races than their own, the remainder would be rather a miserable affair.

That is one side of the question. There is also the

other. I think we may safely say, and all but the most case-hardened commercial Imperialists will agree with us, that if you were, at almost any time in the last few centuries, to search through the world for the greatest crimes and the greatest miseries inflicted by man upon man, you would find them in the peoples, especially the weakest and lowest peoples, who are being governed or exploited by alien Powers. The contact of a high civilisation with a low is always a danger-point to humanity. [If anyone thinks I speak too strongly here, I recommend him to study the history of the treatment of the blacks in Australia, in the New Hebrides, in the Congo territory, in the Cameroons, of the slaves in old days in the West Indies.]

The problem before us is, how two races, the one ruling and the other subject, can live together with advantage to both, each getting as far as possible good from the other and not injury. The problem varies, of course, in every single case. Notably it varies according to the extent of the gulf between the two races. The gulf between an Englishman and a Polynesian or a Negro is enormous: that between an Englishman and an Irishman, between a German and a Pole, is practically non-existent. Between a Russian and a Finn—well, I do not wish to-night to speak of that great crime against civilisation, but if Russia is to be judged by its Government, it is easy to see there that the stronger power is on the lower side of the gulf and not on the higher. Our relations with the ancient civilisations of the East occupy an intermediate position of special difficulty.

Now, roughly speaking, the great sources of trouble are three: first and chief, even with the best intentions in the world, there is the ordinary lack of mutual understanding; secondly, there is the commercial exploitation, when we try to make money out of our subjects instead of protecting them; thirdly, there is a feeling of rivalry and jealousy between subject and ruler. In dealing with the lowest races this feeling of rivalry does not

come in at all, whereas lack of mutual understanding is almost inevitable.

I have been reading lately the White-book of the Territory of Papua, *i.e.*, the annual report made to the Australian Commonwealth Government. It is an admirable government, and the traders are few and well under control. As you read the report of one local magistrate after another you feel that they are all acting as true Ποιμένες λαῶν, "shepherds of their people," always helping, tending, protecting, not destroying and exploiting and identifying civilisation with the newest form of rifle. Yet in the midst of this understanding and sympathetic atmosphere, one comes again and again across the complaint, "It is impossible to understand the workings of the native mind." I will give one instance. A native had confessed to a cannibal murder. Capital punishment has been abolished for such offences by the present Governor. The man was imprisoned for three years. And after two years in prison, it turned out that the man had not had anything whatever to do with the murder. He was asked why he had confessed; and it appeared that he had confessed because he thought it was expected of him! As far as one can make out, it was just a case of the extreme suggestibility common in savages. But we came there within an ace of hanging an innocent man, and, if we had, his relations would have resented it.

As a second instance, let me read you a passage from a letter about the state of the natives in another territory, also one presided over by a peculiarly able and sympathetic Governor. I give no names as I have not the express permission of the official who wrote me the letter.

> The absorption has been going on for ten years. What of the already absorbed? Speaking for this province I can say that the average wage-earning native is worse-fed and worse-housed than he is in his own village. The social and moral environment he inherited is destroyed. He lives under

a social anarchy with crime and prostitution as the two most prominent symptoms. The laws are generally made for his master and always work for his master's advantage. I am aware of the efforts of the Provincial Commission. What chance is there of that fruit of knowledge ever being used?

In Europe for generations we have been making laws for the workers with hands. Here, though citizenship is an impossibility for the worker, and a wide gulf of race hinders almost every spark of kindly comprehension, law, and administration more than law, gives no protection. Elsewhere a man is encouraged to live by a few acres of his own; here no small pressure is used to make him leave his own land to work for the large landowner, often an absentee. And so through the scale of his life. The most serious fact in the country to me is that with few exceptions the natives do not believe that we are here for their advantage. The millions Britain has spent for them they don't know of. They have seen the spending, but to their mind it is spent for others. Every Government institution that comes close to them, the tax, the road pass, the road making, the pressure to go to work at a distance for wages, how can they otherwise appear than as exactions? . . . I treated the other day a native who had lost the fingers of his right hand in a maize-mill—there have been two, in fact, this last month. I know of an old woman the other day heavily fined for unwittingly crossing an unmarked quarantine boundary with cattle. Any of us could give dozens of cases like these.

That is the dark side of what is generally regarded as a most successful and beneficial government. The trouble there is chiefly due to the commercial exploitation of the country. And that is very often the case. As officials and governors we generally send men of high ability and high principle. We send on the whole the best men we possess. The danger of real cruelty comes not from the officials, but from the traders and adventurers and the broken men who hang upon the skirts of civilisation, driven always on by the absentee master of the traders, the unconscious but ever-grasping shareholder.

If these evils can be kept down, if we keep public opinion in England always awake, and insist that English opinion, not local opinion, must always be the

ultimate judge, if we send good men as officials, pay them well and do not leave them too long a prey to fever and tropical irritation, and if further we keep a firm hand upon all traders and adventurers who are trying to make fortunes out of the native, we ought to be able to make governments of this kind into bright spots and not dark in the general history of humanity.

I have spoken at some length about these lowest races, because they need always to be thought of, and they cannot speak for themselves. We are going to-night to hear about a very different kind of problem, namely, our relations as a government with the old and high civilisations of the east, Egypt and India.

The worst things that occur in India seem to be due to the survival of methods of bad government dating from before our time, and no doubt allowed to continue by our lack of thorough understanding and lack of power. I mean such things as the occasional corruption of the police and their use of torture. Other bad things, not in their intention but in their consequences, are the almost inevitable results of planting a highly expensive western government upon a people with a much lower standard of expenditure.

The present state of strain and alienation which has arisen between our Government and many of the most progressive minds of India is a deplorable thing, and one which calls for the utmost exercise of thought and patience. One thing chiefly is clear to me. On both sides of this quarrel we have able men, honest and high-minded men. We have certainly given of our very best to the government of India. I believe that India has given of her best to movements of the sort in which Mr. Lajpat Rai is a leader. (I may mention that a high official who approved of Mr. Lajpat Rai's deportation told me that there were few men in India for whom he had a greater respect.)

If we are to attain any result at all from these conferences we must all rid ourselves of many evil memories.

Or if we remember the facts, we must rid ourselves of the passions and resentments that form round them. Both sides have something to forgive.

And one word more. If ever it were my fate to administer a Press Law, and put men in prison for the books they write and the opinions they stir up among their countrymen, I should not like it, but I should know where to begin. I should first of all lock up my old friend Rudyard Kipling, because in several stories he has used his great powers to stir up in the minds of hundreds of thousands of Englishmen a blind and savage contempt for the Bengali. And many Bengalis naturally have read these stories. You cannot cherish a savage contempt for anyone without its being quickly reciprocated. And when both sides regard each other with the same savage contempt, it is not likely that they can dwell together in peace. And in case Mr. Kipling should feel lonely in his cell, I would send him a delightful companion, Mr. Anstey of *Punch*. Year after year, clever natives of India come over to England at great sacrifice of money and trouble, to study in our Universities and satisfy our tests for obtaining positions in their own country. They compete with us well, and with all the odds against them. And year after year they have found in our greatest weekly newspaper caricatures of themselves—ridiculous Baboos, cowardly, vain, untruthful, in every way absurd, talking bad and bombastic English (not nearly so correct, I suppose, as Mr. Anstey's Hindustani), held up for the amusement of the public. Now if these men are to be in any sense our subjects, that sort of thing is not fair play. It is not fair play, and it is not decent policy. If you must insult somebody, insult one who is free and can hit you back. If you want to govern a man, and to have him a loyal and friendly citizen—well, you must give up that luxury. You cannot govern the man and insult him too. This incessant girding at the Bengali, the most intellectual and progressive of the peoples of India, has

an ugly look. It goes along with much irritable hostility to the Congress, to the students, to almost every Indian society that professes high aims—such, for instance, as the Arya Somaj. There is in such sneers something perilously like jealousy. And if ever in a ruling race there creeps in a tendency to be jealous of its subjects, to dislike them for their good qualities rather than their bad, to keep them out of power not because they are unfit for power, but because they are too obviously fit; such a tendency is, I believe, disastrous to any empire, and the individuals and parties who foster and inflame it have forfeited their claim to stand among the great leaders and governors of the world.

EGYPT'S DEMAND

Mohamed Bey Farid

(A translation will be found in the Appendix)

Je suis trés heureux de parler en Angleterre et devant un auditoire composé pour la plus grande partie d'anglais. En Angleterre même je suis plus libre que je ne le suis dans notre pauvre pays d'Egypte gouverné en sous main par une poignée d'impérialistes qui font tort à la nation anglaise en croyant la servir. Je tiens à vous dire tout d'abord que je m'adresse à la nation anglaise, non en sa qualité d'occupante mais seulement en sa qualité de nation libre comme je me suis adressé à la nation française dans mes conférence à Paris et à Lyon et comme je m'adresserai à n'importe quelle autre nation civilisée. Nous ne pouvons jamais reconaître l'occupation anglaise; nous la considérons comme illégitime et basée uniquement sur la force brutale qui ne confère jamais le droit. Votre gouvernement, poussé par les impérialistes et les financiers, peut proclamer son protectorat sur l'Egypte ou même se l'annexer, que sa position au point de vue du droit international n'en sera point plus légitime: la force ne prime jamais le droit et notre droit à la propriété de notre terre natale où nos ancêtres sont ensevelis est un droit imprescriptible dont la longue possession, le protectorat ou même l'annexion ne saura nous dépouiller. C'est donc fort de mon droit que je parle, la voix haute, la tête haute avec la conviction qus le droit l'emportera un jour, et que l'intérêt de la Grande Bretagne lui recommandera de se faire des amis et non des ennemis partout où ses intérêts se trouvent engagés.

Vous savez tous, Mesdames et Messieurs, que l'Angleterre est venue en Egypte en 1882 pour aider le

Khédive Teufik à combattre l'armée rebelle et le remettre sur son trône; elle est entrée en amie elle n'a pas fait la guerre à la nation égyptienne, donc elle ne peut se prévaloir d'aucun droit de conquête.

Elle devait logiquement sortir aprés avoir dispersé l'armée d'Arabi et reconduit Tewfik à sa capitale.

Apres la condamnation d'Arabi et de ses principaux partisans, elle s'est occupée à réorganiser une nouvelle armée dans laquelle elle s'est réservée le droit de commander la moitié des bataillons. Ensuite elle a pris comme prétexte pour prolonger son occupation la révolte du Mahdi au Soudan. Vous savez tous comment les impérialistes ont sacrifié Gordon Pacha et tous les fonctionnaires civils et militaires du Soudan sans les secourir à temps, et ont ensuite obligé la Gouvernment Egyptien à évacuer le Soudan et le laisser à l'anarchie complète. C'est à cette occasion que Lord Granville, ministre du Foreign Office a envoyé à Sir Evelyn Baring la trop fameuse dépêche par laquelle il disait que les Ministres Egyptiens doivent toujours se soumettre aux conseils de l'Angleterre, ou se démettre. Feu Chérif Pacha, Premier Ministre donna sa démission pour ne pas signer l'ordre d'abandonner le Soudan. La frontière d l'Egypte fut reportée à Wadi Halfa et les impérialistes arguèrent du voisinage du Mahdi pour rester en Egypte et la défendre contre une invasion chimérique venant du Sud.

Entre temps, ils avaient trouvé moyen de a'immiscer dans tous les Ministères en faisant entrer Mr. Dunlop au Ministère de l'Instruction Publique, Mr. Settle à l'Intérieur, Mr. Scott à la Justice, etc. Celui-ci en présence de la résistance du ministre, Riaz Pacha, fut nommé d'abord pour une année. Jusqu'à la mort de Teufik Pacha le 8 janvier 1892 tout alla bien pour les anglais d'Egypte. Le défunt Khédive ne résistait pas, se contentait de souffrir et de se plaindre à ses intimes, ainsi qu'il le faisait souvant à feu mon père. Il a reconnu qu'il a commis une fauts irréparable en se jetant dans

les bras de l'Angleterre et il s'en repentait amèrement : qu'il dorme en paix et que Dieu lui pardonne!

Le Khédive actuel, Abbas Hilmi II, fut appelé du Térésianum de Vienne, où il faisait ses études, pour succéder à son père. Il avait à peine dépassé 18 ans, l'âge de la majorité. Il était jeune, libéral et avait l'ardeur et la fougue de son âge.

L'Egypte respira et vit dans son avènement la commencement d'une ère nouvelle. Tous les patriotes y virent le chef attendu, celui qui devait rendre au pays sa liberté.

Cette entente entre le Khédive et sa nation ne plut pas à Lord Cromer, qui, habitué à la souplesse résignée de Teufik, chercha alors l'occasion pour lui faire sentir la main lourde de son autorité de tuteur despote. Coup sur coup il humilia Son Altesse aux yeux de l'Europe et aux yeux de ses sujets.

La première fois eut lieu lorsque le Khédive, fort de son droit déposa le Ministère de Mustafa Fahmy Pacha, trop docile à Lord Cromer et à ses ordres, et nomma Hussein Fakhry Pacha à sa place. Cromer jeta feu et flammes, ne reconnut pas le nouveau ministère, ordonna à tous les fonctionnaires anglais d'en faire autant et de ne pas se rendre à leur Ministère. Ce fut la grève des fonctionnaires anglais.

Son Altesse céda et Cromer accepta le moyen terme de nommer Riaz Pacha comme Premier Ministre à la place de Fakhry.

Cependant Mustafa Fahmy rentra quelques temps après dans le ministère et finit par redevenir premier ministre comme il était auparavant.

La seconde fois, lors de l'incident dit de la frontiére, Son Altesse en passant en revue la garnison de Wadi Halfa fit au Sirdar Kitchener Pacha quelques observations sur la tenue des soldats. Le Sirdar câbla la nouvelle à Cromer qui lui ordonna de donner sa démission si le Khédive ne se rétractait pas. Il vit ensuite Riaz Pacha, alors Premier Ministre, et la menaça de faire déposer le

Khédive s'il ne faisait pas des excuses aux officiers anglais *à son service*. Riaz Pacha crut à ses menaces et se dépêcha de rejoindre Son Altesse dana la Haute Egypte et lui conseilla de donner à l'Angleterre la satisfaction que Cromer exigeait. Le Khédive finit par céder devant le force et publia, de la ville de Fayonne où il se trouvait un ordre du jour où il fit l'éloge des bataillons qu'il avait critiqué quelques jours auparavant.

Aprés ces deux incidents dans lesquels Son Altesse résista mais finit par céder devant la force, la guerre continue entre lui et Lord Cromer, sourde, mais acharnée. Cromer ne laissait sucune occasion s'échapper sans faire sentir àu Khédive qu'il était sous sa tutelle et qu'il était lui, Cromer, le chef effectif de l'Etat.

Le mouvement national se développa sous cette politique d'oppression et la haine de l'occupant pénétra jusqu'aux couches les plus profondes de la nation. La Khédive sympathisait avec les nationalistes at faisait agir ses amis d'Angleterre. Quelques membres du Parlement anglais vinrent alors en Egypte, étudièrent la question sur place et appuyèrent les démarches de Son Altesse et du chef des Nationalistes, feu Mustafa Kamel Pacha.

Lord Cromer traitait le Khédive de très haut, le faisait menacer et traiter par les journaux anglais comme enfant jouant avec le feu. Il prétendait que le rôle de l'Angleterre était de protéger la nation contre le Khédive et que si les troupes anglaises se retiraient, le Khédive retournerait à l'ancien régime de ses aïeux. Donc, suivant lui, le rôle de l'Angleterre était changé; au lieu de protéger le trône centre les rebelles, elle protégeait la nation contre son Khédive.

La nation ne croyait rien de tous ces prétextes fallacieux que les impérialistes inventaient pour les besoins de la cause et pour prolonger indéfiniment leur occupation.

Cromer fut maladroit et brutal et commis gaffe sur gaffe. La dernière fut celle de Denchawaï où il souleva

contre son proconsulat la conscience du monde civilisé.

Le Gouvernment anglais, pour sauver les apparences, le garda encore pendant quelques mois, lui suggéra à la fin de présenter sa démission, sous prétexte que sa santé ne lui permettait plus de supporter le lourd fardeau de son poste.

Sir Eldon Gorst fut choisi pour le remplacer, d'accord avec le Khédive, dit-on. Le nouveau représentant de la Grande Brstagne connaissait bien l'Egypte; il a passé plusieurs années à l'Agence Anglaise du Caire et aux Ministères des finances et de l'Intérieur en qualité de conseiller. Il parlait l'arabe et pouvait bien causer directement avec les égyptiens sans avoir recours aux interprètes dont un grand nombre péche par ignorance ou par mauvaise foi. On s'attendait donc à ce qu'il comprît les aspirations légitimes des patriotes et qu'il les aidât à recouvrer leur régime constitutionnel.

Il inaugura son œuvre par une grande déférence envers S.A. le Khédive auquel il rendait visite tous les jours et auquel il rendit les apparences du pouvoir. Les inspecteurs anglais qui parcouraient les provinces et qui annihilaient l'influence des Moudirs, devinrent plus discrets dans leurs agissements et moins arrogants envers les hauts fonctionnaires égyptiens.

En novembre 1908 le ministère de Mustafa Fahmy Pacha que Lord Cromer imposait au Khédive se retira et on laissa à son Altesse une certaine latitude dans le choix du nouveau ministère. Boutros Pacha Ghali en fut le président et trois jeunes pachas furent choisis pour l'intérieur, la Justice et les Travaux Publics. On fonda beaucoup d'espoirs sur ce nouveau Ministère dont la plupart des membres affichaient des sentiments patriotiques ardents et l'amour de la Liberté. Les journaux égyptophobes prétendaient qu'ils étaient des nationalistes. On avait donc raison de croire qus le constitution était à nos portes. Cette croyance était d'autant plus fondée que Son Altesse avait bien accueilli les pétitions que nous avions fait circular dans les pays

pour lui demander la constitution et qui s'etaient couvertes de 50,000 signatures. Déception complète! Sous prétexte que les journaux avaient commis quelques incartades de langage, on ressuscita en mars 1909 une vieille loi sur la presse de 1881, loi purement administrative et arbitraire et qui mettait les journaux à la merci d'un arrêté ministèriel.

Naturellement on manifesta contre ce retour à l'arbitraire, on fit des discours plus ou moins violents, suivant le tempérament des orateurs. Les manifestants furent dispersés brutalement et quelques orateurs poursuivis pour avoir attaqué les conseillers anglais et pour cris séditieux.

Naturellement ces mesures de violence eurent l'effet opposé à celui qu'on en attendait. L'effervescence augmenta et la nation commença de voir d'un mauvais oeil l'accord de Sir Eldon Gorst avec le Khédive et son gouvernement, et n'y vit autre chose que le système de Cromer appliqué en apparence par le egyptien gouvernment, soi-disant de l'occupation, avec cette différence que Cromer protégeait jusqu'à un certain point la nation contre le pouvoir absolu, tandis que Gorst, abandonait la nation entre les mains de l'absolutisme en faisant passer le Khédive pour le véritable maître du pays.

Le ministère commença à perdre sa popularité et un état de malaise régna entre le Khédive et la nation égyptienne.

Les impérialistes jetèrent les hauts cris et prétendirent que le pays était à la veille d'une révolution, comme celle d'Arabi pacha, et qu'il fallait rester dans le pays et renforcer le pouvoir anglais pour protéger le Khédive contre son peuple, qui se détachait de lui.

Nouveau changement de rôle: en 1882, les anglais aidaient le Khédive à battre l'armée rebelle, en 1894 au commencement du règne du Khédive actuel, ils protégeaient le peuple contre son prétendu dispotisme avec lequel il ne tarderait pas à le gouverner si les troupes anglaises venaient à se retirer. Maintenant il protégent

le Khédive et sa dynastie contre le retour de la nation à la rebellion de 1882.

Si Son Altesse sympathisait de nouveau avec les nationalists qu'il accuse actuellement d'être avancés et trop pressés, ils retourneraient à l'anciennes litanies et ainsi de suite à n'en plus finir.

Après le malheureux geste de Wardanni, l'acquittement de ses amis, et le rejet du projet du Canal de Suez par l'Assemblée générale, ce fut le régime de terreur que les impérialistes voulurent introduire en Egypt.

Le Gouvernment egyptien proposa alors à la hâte plusieurs projets de loi ayant pour but : 1° de rendre tous les délits de presse de la compétence de la Cour d'assises qui condamne en dernier ressort sans l'assistance d'un jury; 2° de punir par le renvoi de toutes les écoles du gouvernement des élèves qui participeraient à une manifestation politique à l'école, ou même en dehors de l'école; 3° de punir les directeurs de journaux en même temps que les auteurs des articles incriminés; 4° enfin de punir toute convention ayant pour but de commettre un délit ou un crime et avant le commencement d'exécution, en d'autres termes, de punir l'intention criminelle avant qu'il y ait tentative d'exécution. Le Conseil législatif repoussa le projet relatif au renvoi des délits de presse à la cour d'assises et modifia les autres de manière à éviter les interprétations arbitraires. Eh bien! le Gouvernment passa outre à l'avis de ce conseil et promulga ces lois le jour même où Sir Edouard Grey lançait ses menaces contre nous du haut de la tribune de la Chambre des communes à Londres.

La nation accueillit ces nouvelles lois repressives avec son calme habituel, se contentant de protesta par l'organe de ses journaux. Les journaux européens se joignirent à nous dans notre campagne d'indignation et de protestation contre de pareilles lois qui ne doivent être faites que dans les pays en pleine révolution.

La politique des impérialistes tend à nous faire passer pour des révolutionnaires, des terroristes ou des

anarchistes, pour justifier l'occupation et nous priver du peu de liberté qui nous reste.

J'ai de mon côté protesté contre ces accusations, dans la mesure du possible, dans la presse européenne où j'ai démontré les manœuvres des impérialistes que je vous dénonce ici.

L'Angleterre est assez forte pour imposer sa volonté et sa domination; qu'elle le fasse ouvertement sans nous faire passer injustement aux yeux du monde civilisé pour des fanatiques et des xenophobes! Je vous dénonce, Mesdames et Messieurs, ces manœuvres indignes de la grande nation Britannique et qui la font haïr partout où les impérialistes la poussent à s'implanter.

Ce n'est pas parce qu'un patriote ardent commet un acte, qu'il aura peut-être expié à ce moment, qu'une nation entière puisse être accusée de terrorisme et d'anarchisme! Des crimes politiques se commettent presque tous les jours en Europe et en Amérique sans que l'humanité entière s'émeuve. Le président MacKinley en Amérique, le président Carnot en France, le roi Humbert en Italie, l'impératrice Elisabeth d'Autriche, Don Carlos en Portugal furent assassinés par des anarchistes sans que les autres nations eussent pensé à occuper leur pays ou à en faire la conquête. Vous êtes forts en Egypte et nous y trouvez un gouvernement docile; usez de votre droit du plus fort, mais franchement et loyalement. Mais je suis sûr que la nation anglaise n'approuve pas ces agissements machiavéliques que la politiques intérieure des partis politiques exige; et c'est pourquoi je m'adresse à cette nation anglaise noble et libérale et qui ne demande qu'à être éclairée.

Je ne vais pas vous faire ici le procés de l'occupation ni vous démontrer tout le mal que les agents des impérialistes ont fait à l'Egypte au nom de la nation anglaise; je l'ai développé dans nos conférences à Paris et à Lyon dont je me suis contenté de déposer un exemplaire au bureau.

Je ne vais pas non plus vous démontrer la nullité du traité du 19 Janvier 1899 par lequel l'Angleterre s'est fait reconnaître l'associée de l'Egypte au Soudan. Vous connaissez tous que ce traité est nul et n'a aucune valeur au point de vue de droit international. Il est signé par le représentant du Khédive qui, lui-même, n'a pas le pouvoir de céder aucune parcelle des territoires à lui confiés et d'une suzeraineté qui n'est pas la sienne.

Il est d'autant plus nul qu'il est passé entre deux parties dont l'une se prétend d'être la tutrice de l'autre. Il a juste la valeur d'un acte par lequel un tuteur se fait céder par son pupille une partie de ses biens.

Je suis venu ici au nom du parti national égyptien pour vous rappeler les promesses faites, au nom de la nation anglaise, d'évacuer l'Egypt et la rendre à elle-même et pour vous démontrer que l'honneur de la Grande Bretagne en exige l'exécution.

La nation égyptienne est calme, laborieuse et ne cherche qu'à vivre en paix avec toutes les nations entières, dont elle-même s'engage de respecter tous les droits acquis. Nous ne sommes ni fanatiques ni xénophobes; nous sommes des patriotes et nous cherchons à libérer notre pays de toute ingérence étrangère. Nous demandons la neutralisation de l'Egypte, sous l'égide de l'Europe, avec un contrôle financier international pour sauvegarder les intérêts de nos créanciers.

Je m'addresse à tous les libéraux de la Grande Bretagne aux membres du parlement que l'impérialisme n'égare pas, à ceux qui ont aidé les russes à avoir le régime constitutionnel, nos compatriotes ottomans à consolider le leur, à ceux, enfin qui viennent de protester contre l'abolition des privilèges des finlandais.

Je leur demande d'intercéder auprès de notre Khédive pour qu'il nous rende notre constitution et de prier leur gouvernement de ne pas empêcher le Khédive de se faire et d'exécuter les promesses faites au nom de la nation anglaise.

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF INDIA

LALA LAJPAT RAI

ALTHOUGH I would have very much liked to examine the argument which is so often used against us, viz., that representative institutions are foreign to the genius of the Asiatic people and that history knows of no period when such institutions existed in Asia, I will, however, resist the temptation to start that discussion to-night; nor do I propose to discuss when and under what conditions one people is justified in imposing their rule on another. My immediate object is to draw attention to what is going on in India just now, even after the introduction of Lord Morley's reforms. For that purpose I will ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to remember that parts of India have been under British rule for over 150 years. It was in 1773 that the first Act for the better government of that country was passed by Parliament. For over fifty years India has been under the direct management of the Crown and Parliament.

During all these years we have had what Lord Morley has called "absolute and personal government" without the people of the country having any effective voice in the management of the affairs of their country, on the one hand, and without the advantages of absolute and personal government, such as we had under Akbar and others. Yet we lived in hopes of better times; we argued that although for the time being we were worse off in certain respects, in certain others we were better off, and that under the guidance of freedom-loving Britain, we could look forward with confidence to having one day a democratic form of government in our

country which would compensate us for all the losses we endured through the present system of arbitrary rule. Our hopes were based upon the utterances of some of the greatest and noblest of British statesmen and upon the late Queen's Proclamation of 1858, and they reached their climax when in 1906 a Liberal Government came into office with Ministers on whom had fallen the mantles of Gladstone, Bright, and Ripon. The disillusionment, however, did not take very long to come, and, when it came, it came like a thunderbolt from the blue heavens. Early in 1907, on account of certain agrarian disturbances in the Punjab, the noble Secretary of State for India gave his sanction to a proceeding which before it actually happened, no one could have considered possible under a Liberal Government. An old obsolete regulation of the East India Company, passed in 1818 when the country had not yet settled down and the British were, in several parts of India, still fighting for their supremacy, was raked up, and two Indians, one of whom was your humble servant, were arrested and deported. One fine afternoon, after I had just finished a letter to Sir W. Wedderburn asking him to interest some friends in Parliament in Punjab affairs, I was caught without my being told why and for what reason, and at once carried thousands of miles away from my place. For a little over six months I was a prisoner, and after that I was released. Neither when arrested nor when released was I told the reason of my arrest and the nature of the information upon which that action was taken. During my confinement, as well as after my release, I asked the Government in India to give me that information, and failing in that, I came over to this country and repeated my request to the Under-Secretary for the time being, but with no better results.

Between then and now there have been other deportations without trial, and all efforts to get the regulation removed from the Statute Book have been

futile. So the Executive in India retains the power to remove any and everyone who happens to have incurred their displeasure or the displeasure of a proverbially corrupt police, without the least semblance of a trial, and without his having any opportunities of questioning the information against him or the honesty of the informers. Yet we kept on hoping for better things from Lord Morley, who was known to be engaged on a very liberal scheme of reforms in the government of India.

This scheme was announced in December, 1908. It was not in any sense of the term very generous. It did not profess to give us any control over the finances of the country, which, after all, is the principal test of a popular form of government; nor did it give us any voice in the appointment of the officers of State who were to carry on the Administration. The Supreme Council was still to have a packed official majority with a veto vested in the Viceroy to overrule any legislation that might pass through the Provincial Councils. The finances, the military, and education were all outside the scope of the Provincial Councils. In spite of these drawbacks, Lord Morley's reform scheme was hailed with joy. The leading men of the Congress Party expressed their gratitude in language which, in the light of subsequent experience, seems extravagant. The outstanding features of Lord Morley's scheme as originally framed by him were the introduction of a democratic element, however small, in the elections to the Councils, and the non-official majorities in all Provincial Councils. Both these, however, were ruined by subsequent modifications, and the scheme as it finally emerged from the hands of the Government of India was the most mischievous that could be conceived in the present state of Indian politics. It has permanently divided the country into two hostile camps —Mohammedan and non-Mohammedan. It has generated a feeling of hostility between the landed

interests and the educated classes. It has seriously reduced the influence of the literate class. The provision giving non-official majorities in the Provincial Councils has been converted into a farce. The system of single votes, which was an essential feature of Lord Morley's scheme has been cast to the winds; the injustice of double and plural voting, which Lord Morley tried to avoid, has been given the fullest play. Some people have got three votes, while the vast majority of the people have none. The regulations have been so framed and so worked up as to place the majority in the population at a distinct disadvantage as compared with minorities. Backwardness in education and otherwise has been rewarded with such special concessions as to make the backward minorities the master of the situation. These latter have been granted direct representation; while it has been denied to others. Mohammedans who pay an income-tax on an income of £200, or land revenue in the same sum, and Mohammedan graduates of five years' standing, have been given the right to vote, while a Hindu or Parsee, paying an income-tax on an income of say £5,000,000, or a graduate of say forty years' standing has been denied that right. Then the restrictions placed on the choice of electors are so many and so cleverly worded, as to exclude most of those who are likely to exercise the powers granted by the new scheme with any show of independence. Just think of a scheme which made Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, the gentleman who represented India in the Imperial Press Conference, ineligible for election to the Local Council of his province. On a hue and cry being raised an exemption was made in his case, of which he very properly declined to avail himself. The property qualifications would make men like Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji ineligible for election to the Provincial Councils.

Then the clause relating to the disqualifications is extremely unreasonable. Persons dismissed from

Government service, or imprisoned for an offence punishable with imprisonment for more than six months, regardless of the nature of the offence, are disqualified. But still worse is the provision which empowers the Executive to declare anyone ineligible for election whom they consider to be of such reputation and antecedents that his election would, in the opinion of the Executive, be contrary to the public interest. In exercise of these powers the Bombay Government disqualified a man whose sole offence was that he had been imprisoned for a fortnight for contempt of Court, and whom Mr. Gokhale considered to be pre-eminently fitted for a seat on the Council. Let me give you one or two concrete instances of the so-called non-official majorities in the Provincial Councils. In the Punjab, the province from which I come, the Council consists of fourteen non-official members, as against eleven officials; out of these fourteen only five are elected. The rest are all nominated by the Executive. In the United Province of Agra and Oude, there are twenty-six nominated members, as against twenty elected; twenty out of the twenty-six nominated members are officials, and out of the remaining six, two are ruling chiefs, having no interest in British districts. Then the beauty of the whole thing is that while the work of the Council is done in English, several of these nominated members of the Punjab and United Province Councils are quite innocent of a knowledge of that language. You will thus see what the reforms mean, and in what spirit they are being worked out.

Is it any wonder, then, that the reforms have fallen flat, and have not satisfied even the Moderates among Indian politicians. But what little chance there was of their influencing the people for good has been removed by the policy of whole-hearted repression and suppression which is being rigorously followed in India. Hardly a mail comes which does not tell us that so many people have been imprisoned for sedition, and so

many papers and presses suppressed by summary action of the Executive. Within less than four years we have had two gagging Acts. By the first, passed in 1908, the Government have added to their powers by enabling magistrates, at the request of the Executive, to make orders, confiscating newspapers which they think incite people to violence. These orders might be made after hearing the persons implicated, or in an emergency even in their absence. They are appealable to the High Court.

By these magisterial orders many papers are confiscated, and their printing presses attached. By the second Act, passed this year (1910), the Executive have obtained an extraordinary control over the Press. Under this Act the Executive of every province have acquired the right, without the intervention of a court of justice, to forbid the coming into existence of any printing press or paper except after payment by the owner of a heavy pecuniary security, which might be declared forfeited to the Government if the press or the paper published what the Government considered illegal matter. There is an appeal against this ban, though there is none provided against the order for finding the security. The Government might, under this new law, declare any paper, book or document, whether printed in India, or England, or elsewhere, forfeited, and order it to be seized by the police, and all suspected premises to be searched, although the owners are not charged with any legal offence. Fresh powers have been given to the Customs and Police officials to seize and detain for the Government suspected newspapers, books and journals, for the inspection of the local Executive.

The category of offences created by this Act is so interesting as to include all documents which contain any words, signs, or visible representation that are likely or may have a tendency, directly or indirectly, whether by inference, suggestion, allusion, metaphor, implication, or otherwise, to bring into hatred or contempt, not only His

Legislative Library Ontario.

Majesty's Government, but also any native prince or chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty, or any class or section of His Majesty's subjects in India, or to put any person in fear or to cause annoyance to him and thereby induce him to deliver to any person, any property or to do or omit to do any other act, or to encourage or incite any person to interfere with the administration of law or with the maintenance of law and order, or to convey any threat of injury to a public servant *or even to any person in whom that public servant is interested.* A large number of papers in India have ceased to exist in consequence of the exercise of powers granted to the Executive by this Act, and a good many others have had to furnish heavy security for offences which are not specified legally, as the Executive does not consider itself bound to give that piece of information to the persons condemned.

This necessarily imperfect summary of the two Acts might give you some idea of how the liberty of the Press, enjoyed by India for the last seventy years (with only two temporary breaks during that time) has been done away with. But that is not all. The right of public meeting, too, has been seriously curtailed by what is now known as the Seditious Meetings Act, which has now been extended to the whole of India. The Act provides that no public meeting (every meeting of more than twenty persons, even if held in a private place, is presumed to be a public meeting) shall be held in any proclaimed area unless previous notice of the intention to hold such meeting, and of the time and place of such meeting has been given to the police at least seven days previously, or unless permission to hold such meeting has been obtained. The Act empowers the District Magistrate or the Commissioner of Police to prohibit any meeting if they think that it is likely to promote sedition. Besides that, another Act has been passed authorising, in certain cases, trial without jury, and the inquiry by magistrates behind the back of the accused.

All these enactments have added enormously to the powers of a Police whose inefficiency and corruptibility have been testified to by the highest authorities, both executive and judicial.

In my practice as a lawyer, extending over twenty-five years, I have had numerous opportunities of coming into contact with the Police. In my professional capacity, I have often been in opposition to them; but in many cases I have stood up for them, and acted with them. I can say from my personal observation that the lower ranks are teeming with corruption. The miserable pittances allowed to them, as salaries, compel them to be so. Most of them are necessarily illiterate. The Police in India is credited with all sorts of diabolical deeds, and is dreaded and hated beyond description. Yet their powers are vast, and the opportunities of mischief open to them perhaps the most numerous that are known to any system of government having the least pretence to be called civilised.

The last, but not the least of our grievances is that the system of Government in India is sapping our manhood, driving virtue out of the land, and making patriotism and public spirit a crime. The former is achieved by a system of widespread espionage extending to schools and colleges, with the help of an ill-paid, ill-educated, and necessarily corrupt Police, and the latter by repressive laws and vindictive sentences and equally vindictive treatment of political prisoners in gaols. The position of the Indian Bureaucracy makes it impossible for them to tolerate the presence or the growth of a spirit of manliness in the people. Unquestioned obedience, unbounded forbearance, and undisturbed quietude, suit them best. In the nature of things, therefore, they cannot allow any propaganda, which leads to a desire for liberty and a hankering after political independence and creates an atmosphere of resentment against injustice and oppression. This is the genesis of the whole policy of repression, suppression,

and confiscation that has for the first time (in the hoary antiquity of Indian history) given birth to unholy terrorism and ungodly anarchism. No one deplores these more than the responsible Indian publicist, but nothing can justify the extensive and demoralising espionage which is, just now, the prop of British statesmanship in India and is undermining the manhood of the people.

There can be no justification for a policy, which by appealing to the baser instincts of human nature aims at setting up father against son, brother against brother, wife against husband, friend against friend; and last, but not least, teacher against pupil, and *vice versâ*. This is polluting the very fountains of manhood. Yet you cannot help doing it. In the isolation of unit from unit, in the jealousies and rivalries of classes lie the security of your domination. No alien bureaucracy can tolerate the existence by her side of a class of patriotic, self-sacrificing, public-spirited, virtuous men who, by their gospel of manliness, self-help, self-independence, and self-confidence, unconsciously create an atmosphere of dissatisfaction and unrest in the minds of the people. The bureaucrat naturally likes the other class, which has as many grades and shades, from the timid opportunist, to the most bare-faced sycophant and the despicable parasite.

It is this attitude of the authorities—natural as I say—under the peculiar circumstances (of British domination) that creates a general atmosphere of distrust and fear, and that makes the Government look with suspicion upon movements which aim at the educational advancement of the country, or provide relief to diseased or distressed humanity, otherwise than through Government agency or under their patronage.

I could write a volume of my personal experiences in this matter, but I will conclude my statement with the testimony of an English lady, of high character, and of great fame. Speaking of the official attitude

towards the Central Hindu College, Benares, Mrs. Besant says that the College had to struggle against the dead weight of official antagonism from its inception, because of its independence. It has never taken any Government money, nor offered to officials seats of power in its management. That has been exactly the reason why the officials look down upon it with suspicion.

It is a strange irony of fate that the policy of repression and suppression should have reached its climax under a Liberal Government, and worse still, that these things should have been done in the name of Burke, Mill, Macaulay, and Gladstone. The people of India had hoped so much from the Liberal Party that this policy of repression coming from the latter has driven them to a state of despair.

But before I proceed to enumerate the political grievances and disqualifications from which the Indian people suffer, let me make it clear that in my opinion most of India's fundamental grievances are such as are inherent in every foreign rule, particularly when that rule is carried on in the name and on behalf of a democracy. The best foreign Government is after all a poor substitute for Self-Government, much more so when it is the government of many. All of you know the famous dictum of Mill that "such a thing as the government of one people by another cannot and does not exist. One people may keep another as a warren or preserve, for its own use, a place to make money in, a human farm to be worked for the profit of its own inhabitants."

It follows, then, that in the opinion of Mill, every people have an inherent and absolute right to govern themselves, whether such government of themselves by themselves be good or bad or indifferent. With my imperfect knowledge of English, it seems to me that Mill's dictum is absolute and not susceptible of any qualifications. Yet we have been told by so high an

authority as Lord Morley that somewhere in his book on "Representative Government" Mill has said that "Government by the dominant country is as legitimate as another, if it is the one which in the existing state of civilisation of the subject people most facilitates their transition to a higher state of civilisation." To me this qualification seems to go to the root of the first dictum and be quite incompatible with it. Firstly who is to decide what is "a higher state of civilisation"?

Is it to be determined by the "dominant country" or by the subject people, or by both, or failing an agreement between the two, by an umpire like Mr. Roosevelt? Then is not civilisation, after all, a sort of "sentimentalism"?

The majority of Indians have no doubt in their minds that if simple living and high thinking is civilisation, if loftiness of thought, of morality, and of man's mission in this universe is civilisation, if spiritual insight is civilisation, then the civilisation bequeathed to them by their forefathers is in no way inferior to any. The fact is that your civilisation is of a different type from ours. While we can learn a great deal from you, you can learn a great deal from us, and at best it is extremely doubtful if a substitution of yours for ours necessarily means progress toward a higher form. But assuming that it does, does it not then follow, as has been recently pointed out by one of your best writers, in commenting upon Mr. Roosevelt's speech, that you should give us what is your best? Can there be any doubt in what is your best? "The greatest thing Europe has made is the citizen; the idea of the average man, free and full of honour." All else is mere machinery: "Railways only exist to carry the citizen; forts only exist to defend him; electricity only to light him; medicine only to heal him. Popularism, the idea of the people alive and patiently feeding history, exists everywhere, East and West. But democracy, the idea of people fighting and governing—that is the only

thing Europe has to give." Well, then, we shall presently see how far you have in the course of over a century given us what is your best, *i.e.*, Citizenship.

The same high authority who quoted Mill's verdict in favour of a dominant country's temporary rule has also given another quotation from Mill, in the same discourse, laying down another condition to justify the domination of one country by another, viz., that " the ruling country ought to be able to do for its subjects all that could be done by a succession of absolute monarchs, guaranteed by irresistible force against the precariousness of tenure attendant on barbarous despotisms, and qualified by their genius to anticipate all that experience has taught to the more advanced nations." Failure to do this, in the eyes of Mill, " makes the dominant people guilty of a dereliction of the highest moral trust that can devolve upon a nation." Now assuming all this to be true, our first complaint is that the bulk of British administrators do not admit that England is in India to facilitate the latter's transition to a higher state of civilisation. Even the two political parties who govern the Empire alternately do not seem to be agreed on this point.

The Anglo-Indian Press and the Anglo-Indian administrator both deny it. There have been and there are Englishmen who have taken that view—all honour to them—but, as I have said, the mass of those who actually administer the affairs of India do not accept that proposition.

A French observer, whose observations have been very much coloured by his close association with a high Anglo-Indian official in the Government of India, has by close observation on the spot and by close association with the Anglo-Indian mind testified to that. Monsieur Chailley—that is the name of the French observer—has stated in his book on "British Indian Administrative problems" that the generality of Englishmen do not approve of the idea that " their mission in India "

is "to educate the people, to make a nation of them, and prepare them for the task of self-government"; that they no longer look forward to the day "when that task accomplished, they would retire, leaving it to its own destinies, a glorious child of their genius."

"British occupation for ever" is the keynote of Anglo-Indian statesmanship. Consequently, their whole force is being employed to prevent the growth of that "political personality," non-existence of which at the present time is the basis of their power. How that is done is familiar to every observer of British administration in India. Monsieur Chailley has indicated it in more than one place in his book. Noticing the Hindu wail that the British stepped into India just at the time when the Hindus were regaining their lost independence, he says that "the British, who *have based the uneasy security of their dominion on the divisions of their subjects*, look at matters from a different point of view." Again, he says that "without exactly aiming at an equilibrium of forces among elements of unequal value, they (*i.e.*, the British) endeavour to take advantage of their rivalry" (*i.e.*, the rivalry of the Hindus and Mohammedans). This, then, constitutes our second grievance. The interests of the "transition to a higher state of civilisation," the only conditions justifying a foreign domination in the eyes of Mill, demand that the dominant country should aim at and help in the effacement of all those "divisions" and "rivalries" that stand in the way of the development of a "political personality." India, however, is being ruled in a contrary spirit and almost everything possible is being done to prevent the political unification of the Indians into one nation. British domination in India has, within the last 100 years, been so managed as to have accustomed the Britisher to consider it a possession from which they are, by every canon of morality, entitled to profit.

The benefits conferred on the inhabitants of the

United Kingdom by British domination in India have been so extensive, so varied, and spread over such vast areas, that it is now quite shocking to some British ears to hear that India should be governed, primarily at least, if not solely, in the interests of Indians. Even the idea of some loss in the profits hitherto made and in the privileges hitherto enjoyed is so unpleasant as to make it impossible to entertain it seriously. Some say it is "damned nonsense," others call it "sentimentalism."

The Superman from America has just told them that "of all reeds 'sentimentalism' is the most broken reed on which righteousness can lean." So that settles the matter; more so when our kind and benevolent rulers discover and allege that with all our religious and caste divisions and the rapacity of our money-lenders and landlords, it is best in our own interests that India should be ruled by impartial outsiders, who have no interest to favour one at the cost or to the detriment of the other. At this stage the argument that every labourer is worthy of his hire follows of course, and sets at rest the financial drain objection. Everyone, however, forgets that the employer who has to pay at the dictation of his employee, and that too at the point of the bayonet, is lost. The national laws of every country would give a different name to such conduct, but here we are to be guided not by national but international laws.

This directly leads us to our third grievance, viz., that our purse is entirely at the disposal of our masters. We have no voice in determining how much shall be taken from us and how it shall be spent. All that is done for us by our foreign rulers. "But you have been under that disability," say they, "for centuries. What reason have you to complain of that and to demand a departure from that time-honoured practice now?" Yes, sirs, it may have been so for some time, but then you forget that every farthing

taken from us by our former rulers was spent in the country and for us if not altogether by us. In ninety-nine cases out of every hundred it was even spent by us. Throughout Moslem régime the finances of the country were in the hands of the people of the country. We collected the revenue, and we spent it in the name and on behalf of the sovereign. Under British rule not a single Indian has ever been entrusted with the Finance Portfolio. Even now we collect the revenue for the British, but we neither fix it nor have any voice in spending it. The other day the elected members of the Viceroy's Legislative Council demanded that free elementary education be introduced in the country by gradual steps. This is a matter upon which the whole country—Hindus, Mohammedans, and everyone else, except the British garrison and a few sycophants from amongst the Indians—feels like one man.

But "No," says the British bureaucrat, "I know better than you do. Free elementary education cannot be given. It is neither to your advantage, nor can money be spared for it." Heavily taxed as we are in proportion to our incomes, I would rather be more taxed than be denied the boon of education. But none dare make that proposal, nor dare the Government have resort to it. One fears unpopularity, the other discontent. Taxation has already reached its limit, and though now and then fresh taxes are imposed in the broad interests of the Empire, that cannot, with impunity, be done on a very large scale. The fact is that the army and the foreign drain, between themselves, eat up the greater part of the revenues. The fiscal policy of the Government is determined by considerations and interests other than Indian; now by Imperial, at other times by party considerations. Even the English Tariff Reformer cannot discuss Indian finance on its own merits; while he is prepared to impose a protective tariff against countries other than British he dare not suggest such a course as against Lancashire or the British Colonies.

Then every succeeding Viceroy and Commander-in-Chief goes to India with a pocketful of schemes. One of our most sober-minded and level-headed publicists, a moderate of moderates, has only recently, in a masterly article, pointed out how the finances of the country have been managed within the last twenty years. In the absence of popular control—control by the party whom the shoe pinches—the spending departments have, by their extravagance, *added enormously* to the burdens of the taxpayer without giving him any, or an adequate, return for his money. A proverbially poor country such as ours, with a population of 300,000,000 to back any Government after its heart, is now spending about £22,000,000, out of a total revenue of £73,000,000, on military force alone. Mr. Wacha has traced the growth of the military policy step by step since 1873, showing how it culminated in Lord Kitchener's revolutionary scheme of re-organisation, resulting in the figure for army charges rising from about £11,000,000 in 1874 to about £22,000,000 in 1905. Coming to the growth in Civil expenditure, he has told us how "the cry of efficiency," loudly raised by Lord Curzon, resulted in the establishment by that noble lord of "a variety of new Imperial Departments," of but doubtful benefit to the taxpayer. He has also shown how the Railway policy of the Government, for the past two years, has been of a character which must needs cause the greatest embarrassment in Indian finances in the near future; how the enormous increase in expenditure on Railways of doubtful utility to the population at large has been effected in response to the purely interested outcry of the European Chambers of Commerce and in utter defiance of Indian public opinion; and, lastly, how these increases have resulted in the diminution of funds for more pressing objects of public utility like education, sanitation, and so forth. Nor is Mr. Wacha alone in this criticism of the Government of India's fiscal policy.

Expert European opinion has from time to time spoken in no uncertain voice. The spirited protest of Sir Auckland Colvin, once the Indian Finance Minister, against the never-ending inroads of the spending departments, is well known to students of the history of Indian finance. Colonel Hanna's slashing criticism of the growth of the military expenditure is now history. The reason is obvious. The people who find the money have no voice in shaping either the foreign or the domestic policy of the Government.

These policies are determined for them, but not necessarily in their interests, by foreigners, for whom, however good and benevolent they may be, it is impossible to see things as the former would for themselves. Talk of economy in India and the result is the cutting down by so much of the salaries of officials of Indian origin or the bringing about a reduction of posts or departments filled by them. While the salaries of the high European officers grow, those of the subordinate establishments shrink.

There may be enough room for economy in the ranks of the latter, but it cannot be done without creating a great deal of discontent which is born of contrast. An Indian Finance Minister, responsible to a popular Indian Chamber and backed by Indian public opinion, would, however, do it, without any risk of discontent, and so would an Indian Commander-in-Chief provide for the effective defence of the Empire without spending so much. But Indian Finance Ministers and Indian commanders could only be appointed by absolute monarchs, like Akbar, Jahangir, and Shahjehan. An Edward VII. or George V., sitting on the throne of the Mugal at Delhi or Agra, could do it, but not a Lord Curzon or a Lord Minto. They may occupy the Mugal throne and force the Indian princes, the blue-blooded Sessodia and the Rahtore, to pay them the same homage which they sometime paid to the Mugal, but they are powerless to appoint either a Man Singh or a Tudar Mal to

the high military and civil offices which these historical personages held under the Mugal. So, you see, the second condition imposed by Mill, as justifying the domination of a foreign people, fails in the case of the government of India by the British.

There is another very far-reaching consequence of the alien domination of India which is likely to tell disastrously on her future. From times immemorial India has been the home of cottage industries, of self-contained happy villages, of a long succession of craftsmen who were their own masters and who made and sold things for themselves. Indian manufactures were exported in large quantities and were famous for the excellence of their make, for their exquisite design, for their lovely shapes, and for the beauty of their expression. They were purchased for their intrinsic value and for the spiritual message they had for the world. Hence, except in years of famine, there was never a general widespread squalor or distress in the country. The unhappy quarrels of the capitalist and the labourer were not known. There were no strikes, neither underselling nor forced over-payment. Your factory system, the glory and the shame of Europe, had no place in Indian economy.

From the general happiness point of view, from the point of view of the labourer, from the point of view of higher humanity, ours was perhaps a better system. Under that system we evolved the highest morality, the highest religion, the boldest philosophy, and the most exact science that was known in the pre-modern days. We could do it again if the modern conditions were not forced down our throats almost at the point of the bayonet. Our home industries have been killed, our cottage workshops ruined by the cheap goods of Europe.

In the early days of British rule our manufactures were stopped practically by force, until nothing was left to us to make a living by but agriculture. Now we

grow wheat and cotton and sell it to you in exchange for your cheap cotton prints and imitation jewellery. The only alternative is the hideous chimney which is already rearing its head to the skies, threatening to overshadow every noble instinct, to dwarf every spiritual impulse that exists in the country. Under its shadow no healthy and fruitful plant can grow. It is a jealous and exacting goddess. It is the mother of that cruel, merciless, devouring commercialism which creates such an awful gulf between the rich and the poor, which requires to be seen to be realised in the Babylons of the modern world. Your commercialism, however, has a redeeming feature in the political freedom of your people—the equality of citizenship. To us, however, you propose to give the former without the latter. Your manufacturers would not even let us have that. They try their best to drive us out of the market by getting excise duties imposed upon our own produce. We ourselves cannot attack the chimney, as that will make us almost bankrupt and drive us to starvation.

So the chimney has come to stay, and stay it must. All we can say is that, however unwilling we are to have it, we shall not have it without the redeeming feature, do what you will. In any case we shall be the poorer.

India may lose her soul but the collective soul of the world would also lose with it some of their loftiness and purity, which the Indian soul, with all its faults, contributes to the world's soul. That is what distracts so many of us who are proud of India's past, of India's achievements in the realm of spirit and thought, and who still believe that India has a function of her own to perform in the spiritual economy of the world.

To sum up, the following may briefly be said to be the achievements of the Liberal Government on the side of repression in their last four years' administration in India:—

(1) Deportation of eleven Indians without the

semblance of any trial and without their being told what they were deported for.

(2) The complete gagging of the Press, both vernacular and Anglo-vernacular.

(3) An unholy alliance between the foreign bureaucracy and the landed aristocracy of the land, as well as the capitalist, against the educated classes which is the distinguishing feature of the reform scheme as well as of the new Press Act.

(4) The withdrawal of the right of holding public meetings for the discussion of political grievances.

(5) The withdrawal of the freedom of speech.

(6) Barbarous and brutal punishments for political offences and the barbarous treatment of political prisoners in jails.

(7) Trials without jury in High Courts and magisterial inquiries *in camera*, behind the back of the accused, denying him the right of being represented by counsel in these inquiries.

(8) The inauguration of a system of public and private espionage never before known in British India, resulting in an abnormal increase in the number of spies and in their emoluments.

(9) The introduction of espionage on boys and girls in schools, on ladies in the Zenana and on young men at the Universities.

(10) The open and systematic tampering with the privacy of correspondence in transit.

(11) A most rigorous application of the Arms Act.

(12) A widely extended system of house and disciplinary searches, also indiscriminate searches of Indians returning to their mother country after a sojourn in foreign lands.

(13) The open and systematic encouragement of racial and communal distinctions in the administration of the country by a policy of denominational preferments.

(14) The treating as suspect religious, educational, and social movements.

(15) The open refusal of the Government of India to fulfil their duty in the matter of providing free primary education for their subjects, even by gradual steps.

In fact, the making of every sort of public activity, political, educational, religious, social or philanthropic, a matter of great risk to those who engage therein, thus making patriotism itself a crime.

Against this might be set off Lord Morley's reforms, viz., the addition of an Indian to the three Executive Councils of Bengal, Bombay, and Madras, and one to the Viceroy's Council. But the appointments made to two of three Provincial Executive Councils are not of a nature to evoke gratitude. Moreover, the division of the country into two different camps, Mohammedan and non-Mohammedan, under the highest sanction, has not only taken the grace from the reform scheme, but rendered it the most mischievous scheme ever propounded to perpetuate religious rivalries for political purposes in a country aspiring to be united.

There is only one remedy which can effectually remove the anomaly—viz., giving real self-government on the lines of South Africa.

MOROCCO

Mr. Henry W. Nevinson

[Owing to the unavoidable absence of Mr. Cunninghame Graham, Mr. Henry W. Nevinson was called upon to speak on Morocco, in consequence of his personal knowledge of the country during the Spanish war of 1909.]

Morocco may be coupled with Persia as one of the next independent nationalities to be divided among the Powers, or, perhaps, more likely, to be swallowed whole. The methods by which Morocco's independence is being undermined form a characteristic example of modern acquisition, and for that reason I may be allowed to remind you of them.

By the Anglo-French Convention of 1904, this country recognised the right of France to assist in the administrative, economic, financial, and military reforms in Morocco, and thus we signed away the freedom and property of a people with whom we had no quarrel whatever—a people numbering about 10,000,000 souls, none of whom we had troubled to consult in regard to this arrangement. We signed away another people's freedom and property merely in order that France might allow us to treat Egypt in the same manner as we agreed that she should treat Morocco.

Onr Foreign Office was so blinded with self-satisfaction over this agreement that the German Emperor's intervention and visit to Morocco in 1905 took it quite by surprise, and for a time it appeared that Morocco would supply the occasion of a great European war. The prolonged Algeciras Conference, followed by the

Algeciras Act, was intended as Germany's counter-move to the Anglo-French Convention. By these means Germany hoped to guarantee the independence of Morocco, not through any love of national independence, but simply to prevent the French from acquiring a rich territory and bringing over Moorish troops to reinforce her home army in case of European war. She also hoped to limit the amount of territory granted under any concession and to keep the finance under joint control by means of an Anglo-Franco-German Bank. But, in spite of the Act, France in reality retained her predominant position, especially owing to her agreement with Spain that they should share the policing of the coast towns.

The outbreak at Casa Blanca soon showed what the right of "policing" implied.

A French company had received a concession to build a dock, and had run a railway to a quarry a few hundred yards beyond the town walls, passing through a Moorish cemetery. The neighbouring "tribesmen," indignant both at the railway and the desecration, suddenly attacked the train (August, 1907), and a few Europeans were killed in the ensuing riot. Thereupon a French cruiser, bearing the significant name of the "Galilée," eagerly seized the opportunity to bombard the town, which was destroyed, amid terrible scenes of massacre, partly by the shells and partly by the violence of the inhabitants and "tribesmen," bent on loot. Under the excuse of "protective police," large bodies of French troops were subsequently landed, and a formal campaign begun, to be carried on in 1908 under General D'Amade until the Shawia district was, as a matter of fact, occupied under French authority.

Meantime, the Sultan Abdul Aziz was driven from Fez by his own people (September, 1907),on account of his favour to foreigners, and was superseded by his half-brother, the present Sultan Mulai el Hafid, who

none the less is entirely dependent upon foreign support. And that support is, in reality, French. The State Bank, controlled by the Powers, can stop his revenue by diverting the customs. The Legations at Tangier also control the import of arms for his troops. But ever since the mission of Dr. Vassal, sent by Germany to be the first to recognise his position as Sultan, the Germans have, for good reasons of their own, taken very little active interest in Morocco's destiny, and the French military mission, despatched to Fez last January (1910) to reorganise Hafid's army, makes the authority of France predominant. It appears now that the only event likely to shake that predominance would be a general revival of Islam, accompanied by an attempt at national regeneration, such as has been seen in Turkey, Persia, and, to some extent, in Egypt. Against such a movement France would have to employ several army corps if she wished to establish or maintain her complete supremacy, and it would be hazardous to lock up that number of troops in the mountains and wastes of Morocco while Germany's attitude remains threatening or uncertain. It is, at all events, on that hazard that Germany reckons, as she now watches, with secret satisfaction, the progress of France in her African adventures.

Since Germany thus withdrew from the conflict, the monopoly of France has only once been challenged, and that not very seriously, for the challenge came from Spain. The Melilla campaign of last year (1909) was also an example in little of modern aggression, except only that it failed. The fortress of Melilla, and the country round for a radius of three or four miles, had been Spanish possession for many generations, but otherwise the occasion of the outbreak closely resembled the events at Casa Blanca. Here, too, was a concession—two concessions, one French and one Spanish, but both backed by French capital and Spanish grandees, and one of them manipulated by a Scot. They

conceded mining rights in the mountains, ten or fifteen miles away, and their weakness was that they were granted by a Riff chieftain, Bu Hamara, known as the Roghi, who had been in rebellion against the Sultans for about seven years, and had just about as much right to grant mining concessions as Rob Roy would have had the right to lease the Highlands for shooting. However, the companies were formed, the capital collected, and the railroads to the mines begun. When the rails had been laid for five or six miles, the tribesmen of the Riff, having themselves rebelled against the Roghi, set upon the navvies and murdered five of them; a body of Spanish troops, sent up into the defiles of Mount Gurugu, close to Melilla, was driven back with heavy loss; and Spain sent out a force of some 40,000 men, equipped for a regular campaign, under General Marina.

Never in the course of a wandering life have I seen such ineffectual waste of stores, ammunition, time, and even life, as during the Melilla War. It surpassed the waste of the South African War, not in extent, but in being even less effectual.

After prolonged hesitation and delay, the Spaniards did, nevertheless, succeed in pushing forward along the desert beaches of a salt lagoon, in destroying a small town, in occupying an undefended fortress, and in placing outposts at various points which may possibly assist them in holding the peninsula when the tribesmen of the Riff attack again. That being accomplished, the campaign was allowed to fritter out, chiefly owing to its extreme unpopularity among the Spanish working classes.

That unpopularity was, indeed, to myself the one hopeful and promising point in the whole business. The unwillingness of the reserves to be embarked for a war undertaken for the benefit of *concessionaires* and other capitalists, chiefly foreigners, proved how little trust Imperial aggression can put in the citizen army.

Spain, it is true, professed other objects—its joint exercise of "protective police" with France, and the possibility of converting the salt lagoon into a harbour. But, as in South Africa, the real occasion of the war was the mines and the interests of the capitalists. The outbreak in Barcelona, which followed upon the calling-out of the reserves, showed that there may be a limit to the patience of the industrial classes when they are required to pay for such a cause as that with their taxes and their lives. And this is why I think we may derive some element of hope from the rather futile little campaign. As at Casa Blanca, we can trace in it the ordinary steps by which modern Powers threaten nationalities and reduce races to subjection—the concession, the plea of trade interests and civilisation's call, the pretext of police, the expedition of vengeance, the occupation of territory. Everything was complete in miniature, except that in this case the occupation will probably collapse for want of strength to maintain it. But that thousands of working people actually refused to serve in such a cause, and that the greatest and most progressive city of Spain rose in rebellion rather than remain subservient to the dictates of capitalists, Imperialists, and the religious orders whose interests were thought to be deeply involved—those are facts which we who stand for nationality and freedom may well regard as full of encouragement and future hope.

DISCUSSION

Sir Henry Cotton, having been invited on the platform, said they had all listened with the greatest interest to the address given by Lala Lajpat Rai, who had had practical experience in his own person of some of the methods of repression which were now being exercised in India. Without covering the same ground he wished to draw the attention of the Conference to one result of the present policy of the Government in India. During the past thirty years there had been a growing tendency in India towards Nationalism—towards identification of the various classes and creeds under one common head—towards, in fact, a union of the different classes in the country. In that movement and in the display of a spirit of Nationalism the Hindus, he was bound to say, played a leading part. He thought nothing could be more satisfactory, and that no more healthy symptom of progress could be found than this tendency which had been growing for the past thirty years or more. But the effect of Lord Morley's reforms had been to give a very rude setback to this growing sentiment. There was an old motto which had come down from the Romans, and which, translated into English, was "Divide and rule." None of them would think it was a wise or politic rule to follow, and it was to the credit of our former administrators in India that it had never been the policy in that country. They had never attempted to divide the races or the creeds. That had never been in the past the policy of British rulers in India. But a new policy had now been adopted, and it had already produced most disastrous results, and most evil effects. He now heard every day of separate organisations. There was the Moslem League, of which they were all aware, and in contradistinction to that League a Hindu League was now being formed in order to focus and present purely Hindu views. Then, again, there was the Parsee League, and in fact all sections of the Indian community had been stimulated to new efforts by the undue encouragement which had been given to the Mohammedans by the present Government. The sense of nationalism, the feeling of patriotism and pride in belonging

to a great country had, as far as it was possible for a Government to do it, been gradually diminished and weakened. That, he ventured to think, was a result which was more injurious to the welfare of India than anything which had happened in the country in recent times.

With regard to the methods of repression which were being practised in India he would not say that they were due to the suggestion or instigation of the Home Government, because they were due to the initiative and to the action taken by the authorities in India, although they were supported and defended, if not absolutely encouraged by the Government at home. But the fact was those repressive methods had culminated lately in the Press Act, which had stifled free expression of opinion in India. As a practical illustration of that Act he would refer to the proscription of their Chairman's pamphlet, "The Methods of the Indian Police in the Twentieth Century." It would have been incredible ten years ago that the publication of such a pamphlet would have been prohibited by the Government, and it showed the demoralisation which had set in among the local government, that it should have happened to-day. So absolute was the state of panic which had been established that when a pamphlet strictly based upon official documents and public records was printed and circulated, it was, because it criticised the form of administration which prevailed, not only condemned, but actually denounced as encouraging hatred and contempt of the Government, was declared to be forfeit to His Majesty, and was prohibited from importation into the country.

Mr. Dube, speaking from the audience, complained that the Government had failed to carry out either in the letter or the spirit the terms of its proclamation, and demanded that the Indian people should be treated with equal rights and privileges as were enjoyed by the English people. He instanced the treatment of Indians in South Africa, and submitted that loyalty and good fellowship could not be expected unless justice and fairness were administered to all classes of his Majesty's subjects. There could, he asserted, be no more peace, order, and fellowship unless the Indians, irrespective of creed, colour, or race, were treated in every way as well as the English.

Time unfortunately did not allow of further discussion, and the Conference was adjourned until the following afternoon.

SECOND SESSION

Finland, Persia, Georgia

Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., presided at the Second Session of the Conference on the afternoon of Wednesday, June 29th, while the representatives of Finland, Georgia, and Persia spoke against their common enemy, the Russian Government. Referring to the crime then in course of being committed upon Finland by the Tzar and the Duma, which M. Stolypin had packed with the tools of reaction, Mr. Ponsonby pointed out that the only fault of Finland was her love of constitutional liberty—a liberty which had been guaranteed to her people by successive Tsars for more than a century. It was impossible, he said, for any freedom-loving people to stand by silently while the Finns were being robbed of their national rights, and it was with pleasure he had consented to take the chair at this important international protest. Mr. Ponsonby then called on Madame Malmberg to speak for Finland.

THE VIOLATED RIGHTS OF FINLAND.

MADAME AINO MALMBERG.

THE events which have happened in Finland now look very much the same as in 1899. Eleven years ago the Finnish Constitution was suddenly and violently broken by Nicholas II., who some years before had most solemnly ratified it. In 1905 our laws were restored, and now they are broken again. But though the outward features are almost the same, the situation is vastly different now.

Up to 1899 Finland had lived a happy life for about a hundred years, and both the advantages and disadvantages of such a life in petty surroundings and with few troubles from the outside, appeared a good deal clearer than in the big countries of Europe.

Because the population is less than three millions, and the nation is young and without traditions, all changes were easier to carry through, and progress could be comparatively quicker, than among the old nations; therefore the development of Finland during the last century was in many respects marvellously great.

Though Finland is a poor country, with very few natural riches, it grew more and more prosperous during the happy hundred years when the nation was left to manage its own affairs and could make both ends meet. One of the greatest advantages during that time—perhaps the very greatest—was that Finland could develop a good educational system and raise the standard of civilisation to a high level.

The amount of quarrel and fight which is necessary for perfect happiness we also got fresh and home-made in our own party strifes.

Legislative Library
Ontario.
Dept.

But, as I said in the beginning, that happy life had also its disadvantages. One of them was that we had almost completely lost the power of understanding the sorrows of others. When our brothers and sisters in the vast Russian Empire were sacrificing all, even their lives, to gain freedom for their country, we felt no sympathy with their struggle: we just sat calm and content in our little corner of the world most loyal to the oppressors of Russia. The Russian Tsars, who would never have dared to show themselves openly in their own country for fear of the intense hatred of their victims, could travel in peace in Finland and be received with all tokens of love by the nation. And even darker sides can be mentioned from that period: During the last unhappy struggle of Poland lots of the Finns went deliberately with the Russians to crush the liberty of that country, while in our own country we had a handful of Jews whom we tried to oppress to the best of our ability. To be short, the Finns developed exactly the same virtues and vices as are characteristic of other happy nations.

It was high time we were stirred up a little. This stirring up came, not slowly and gradually, but like a bolt from the blue, when it pleased His Majesty Tsar Nicholas II. to issue a manifesto which destroyed the Finnish autonomy. That happened in February, 1899.

The way in which we received the blow was very characteristic. At first we simply refused to believe that it was really meant quite seriously. At least it was clear that the Tsar had nothing to do with it. If he could know of it he would certainly hasten to alter matters.

Therefore the first measure, of course, was to bring it to the knowledge of the Tsar. It was decided to send him a petition, expressing the hopes and fears of the nation. In two weeks the petition was signed by more than 500,000 persons, although nobody under 16 years was allowed to sign it. It was sent to St. Petersburg,

but the deputation that took it there was not received, nor was the petition received.

In the following summer another petition, signed by well known European men and women, was taken to St. Petersburg, but the result was exactly the same. The Tsar refused to see either the deputation or the petition.

If anybody still had some uncertainty as to the intentions of the Russian rule in Finland, the Governor-General, Bobrikoff, did his best to remove all doubts. Imprisonments, exile, rapid corruption of officials, and all the other blessings of the reign of Nicholas II. were freely bestowed upon Finland. The Finns were compelled to understand at last—and they did. I am afraid they even learnt the lesson a little deeper than they were meant to.

Up to 1904 the Finns resisted quietly and passively, using all means that a civilised nation has command over. The consequence was that the situation grew worse day by day. M. Bobrikoff revelled in the Imperial Russian methods of "pacifying" a country.

At last the day came when the sufferings of the nation reached their climax and when something had to be done. It was then the young Finn, Eugene Schauman stood up and slew the oppressor of Finland, the Governor-General Bobrikoff, and gave his own life as a sacrifice. The name of Eugene Schauman is sacred in Finland.

After that the situation became somewhat better. And because of the Japanese war and the great revolutionary outburst in Russia in 1905 matters had changed so much that such a wonderful event as the "Great Strike" was possible.

I need not dwell upon the events which are known everywhere. On the unanimous demand of a whole nation the Russian Government had to yield, and we obtained our Constitution again, and new important rights were introduced.

To very many—perhaps to the majority of us—it was, however, clear that this did not mean peace: it only meant armistice. The autocracy was not crushed, it was only disguised, and the time was sure to come when it would prove fatal to all progress both in Russia and in Finland. This belief has come true now.

But, anyhow, those five years of armistice—from 1905 to 1910—have been most blissful in the life of Finland.

During the years of suffering we had our hands full every day, so that very few had an opportunity to observe the deep social development that had taken place in the nation. When in 1905 general adult suffrage for men and women was introduced and the first Diet was elected, out of 200 members eighty were avowed Socialists. It was a complete surprise both to friend and foe. The bourgeois parties tried to comfort themselves by explaining that this deplorable phenomenon was due to the fact that the waves of revolution were still visible everywhere. When the nation had had time to recover and to regain its composure the famous Finnish commonsense would soon show the real character of the people.

That Diet was dispersed and the next one contained eighty-two Socialists!

The same fate has befallen all Diets except the last one, which is still sitting [June 29th, 1910]; and every new Diet has had more Socialist members than the previous one.

It seems clear then that the Finnish nation of to-day is not the same as in 1899. The word "freedom" has acquired a deeper meaning than it had before. It does not mean only political freedom, release from Russian tyranny; it means social equality and a new democratic order of things.

Even the outward expressions of the anxiety of the nation are changed. When the recent manifesto, aiming at the annihilation of our autonomy, was issued,

nobody ever dreamt of approaching the Tsar personally with an appeal for Finland. It is a good sign that even to the wise ones, the cautious ones, the politicians, to those who try their best to prevent the so-called dreamers from helping the world; even to them it seemed too great a humiliation to send an appeal to Nicholas II. Nobody thought of it.

When the members of the foreign Parliaments issued their memorandums they sent them to the Russian Duma. It was known to everybody that the present Duma is not representative of the Russian people, but, anyhow, it was the only body to whom such an appeal could possibly be addressed. I do not think there were many who believed that this act would have any practical results, but at least it was a sign of sympathy for Finland which the Finns will know how to appreciate.

There were many who hoped for some results from the protests of the Chambers of Commerce, because that might have touched the purse, but even that hope proved to be vain.

And what are the Finns going to do now? That is the question I hear almost every day.

Well, only one thing I can assure you with greatest certainty: What has happened does not involve "*finis Finlandia.*" We are not going to perish. We shall live.

And what about the resistance? Will it be passive again?

I should think so—at least to begin with.

But it is to be remembered and clearly understood that passive resistance is possible and effective only provided that the oppressors as well as the oppressed have reached a certain standard of civilisation and intellectual development. I think the Finnish nation has reached that standard. But what do you think is the case with the Russian Government? Is there any example during the whole reign of Nicholas II. which shows that moral or intellectual weapons have had the

slightest effect upon the Russian Government? Has there been anything except gold or lead which could convince the Russian Government of the necessity for tempering their barbarian instincts? What was the effect of the protests of the foreign Members of Parliament? And what was the effect of the clearly expressed opinions of the greatest jurists of Europe?

They only hastened the measures against Finland!

And what has been the effect of passive resistance, or I had rather say hardly any resistance at all, in Russia during the last two years?

That Stolypin's famous necktie has become a national institution!

It is not impossible that the time may come when a new Eugene Schauman will show that even the sufferings of a nation must have their limits.

In the new struggle which has now begun our forces are not the same as in 1899. There may be some who are tired of the fight which seems to them so hopeless, and others who prefer a capitalistic system even under Russian autocracy to a socialistic development of things in a free Finland, but they are few compared with the masses who, fully understanding the new meaning of "freedom," are ready to fight for it with heart and soul.

In this struggle we are not going to hoist our flag half mast, but high to the top. And it will be seen by our brothers and sisters in all the world, because its colour is *red*. Let the strife come, the fight for freedom, not only in Finland, but in the whole world!

Hand in hand, united, we, fighters for freedom, shall crush the old system and create a happier world.

THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF FINLAND

Miss Rosalind Travers

My only claim for venturing to address you this afternoon is that I recently spent nearly a year in Finland. I went there with a perfectly open mind, and the Finnish people won my lasting sympathy and admiration, as, I think, this hardy little people of the land of granite and snow are bound to do in the case of all who approach them without prejudice. Our trouble in presenting the case of Finland to English hearers in general is, not that we have to meet prejudice, but that we must work through a vast dense mass of ignorance. We who are assembled here know how in the face of a most forbidding climate and ungrateful soil, under the continual shadow of tyranny, the Finnish people have gradually risen to a very high level of education and prosperity, and have recently built up the most truly democratic government, the most complete system of popular representation that the world has yet seen.

We know that in this northern outpost of civilisation, as some people imagine it, three highly important experiments in progress have been made, and brilliantly justified in their result. You have in Finland full adult suffrage, proportional representation, and a Government in which the elected house is open to all, without distinction of class, race, or sex. These are familiar facts to most of us here, though not to the generality of English people.

May I now remind you further what sort of a social system it is that the Russian bureaucracy threatens to destroy? In Finland you have a phenomenon of which there is, I believe, only one other example in Europe—a

peasantry who are in the main socialistic. In the Finnish people you find a nation penetrated from end to end with an honest wish for education, a genuine reverence for thought, and a mind hospitable to ideas. And you know, after a long residence in rural England and the Home Counties, this is, in itself, refreshing. For while our social progress is indefinitely delayed by a many-headed feudal anachronism—while we are laboriously re-explaining the first principles of democracy to the intimidated labourer and the retired stockbroker—up there, a day's journey from the Arctic Circle, they are dealing with the problems of to-morrow and their society comes nearer to the ideals of the simple life than anything we have yet attained. For in the social conditions of Helsingfors there are no distinctions of class, wealth, or race; only of political opinions. There the elementary school teacher and the senator, if they belong to the same party politically, can meet on a footing of perfect social equality. There the women, whether highly or lowly born, would think shame to live idle at the expense of their menfolk; for all professions save one are freely open to them, and the ladder of educational opportunity is the same for both sexes. There also, astonishing as it may seem, it is really bad form to be wealthy, and *capitalist* is freely used as a term of reproach.

A word about the persistent calumny that the Russians in Finland are ostracised and treated with contempt. Well, would it be very surprising if they were? The really surprising thing is that they are *not*. I think there is little doubt that the Finns as a race have benefited by that larger intercourse with Russia which dates from about a century ago, and that they themselves acknowledge it. For, to the Russian conquest of 1809, they owe their loosening of the bonds with Sweden, which gradually brought about the renaissance of the real Finnish language—one of the richest and most poetic of European speeches—and the

development of the real Finnish national type which has emerged as a new people in modern Scandinavia. And this new people are very far from being inimical to the Russian *nation*, whatever their attitude towards the Russian bureaucracy may be. I went to Finland as a latent Russophobe, one may say, prepared to dislike Russia and all her works, as one vast symbol of tyranny and corruption, but the tolerance, kindliness, and real brotherly feeling of the Finnish *people* for the Russian *people* soon made me ashamed of my ignorant prejudices. Strange that one should learn from Finns to appreciate Russian character, but it is so.

Yet I must not draw too bright a picture of Finland, for the people of that country often display the most perplexing union of contradictory qualities. They are stolid and somewhat fatalistic, as perhaps only a race of Mongolian origin can be, but swift and unanimous in action when finally roused. They will seem slow and unresponsive, but they are lyrically and musically gifted to a high degree, and have a fiery enthusiasm for knowledge and progress. They are not wanting in national conceit, yet they are almost pathetically anxious to learn of the older races. To sum up, they are in one respect the very inverse of the English people. Their collective work, action, and standards often appear to reach a higher level than that of their individual efforts.

It has been said that life in England represents "communal stupidity tempered by individual intelligence," while the general life of the Finnish people to a great extent represents the very contrary. In this way nearly all that the Finns do collectively is well done. Their public buildings, halls, meeting places, picture galleries, theatres, schools, banks, and flat-dwellings, even, are generously planned and magnificently carried out; but purely individual matters, such as house appointments, furniture, dress, manners, seem by comparison neglected and inadequate. Much of

their individual life is wanting in suavity and grace, and now and then their very high civilisation has the effect of being made in a hurry. It was said lately, with some truth, that Finland stands in need of a Matthew Arnold; but such as the people are, they follow earnestly the best light they have—perhaps, indeed, it is the best light yet vouchsafed to us—and it will be a loss to all Europe if this light is quenched in the darkness of tyranny and misrule.

And yet—whether we give them such help as we can, or stand coldly aside because the liberty of a small and alien race is no concern of ours; whether we shall be able to look back with gladness or with shame upon our actions in this matter—no one who has known the Finns can believe that this hardy little people are destined to succumb. They are made of different stuff to the nations that have gone under. Very patient are the Finns, but very hard; and Fate has trained them to endure. It has been said that the birch tree, the pine, and the granite stone—the first and last things you see in Finland—are the three symbols of Finnish national character. The birch stands for their unexpected gift of lyric beauty, the pine for their unchanging will to progress, and the granite for their steady indomitable resolution, their powers of passive resistance, firm as the granite upon which their cities are built.

Finland has weathered blacker storms than this which now threatens her, and she has won the respect and even the fear of her assailants. Ten years ago she faced the same dangers, unprepared, and only half conscious of her powers, but she fought her way to a triumph which, though only temporary, was of priceless value to her; and she will again. Let me conclude with the words of Juhane Aho, one of Finland's leading writers,—words uttered when the prospects of Finland were even darker than they are now:—

"Many people have entered our country and sought to make their dwelling there, but they only marched

over the moorlands and passed away. The Laplander turned his sledge and drove back to the northern plains where the reindeer moss grows wild. The Swedes laid hold of the fruitful coast lands, but, a league or so from the shore, marshes and wilderness met them, so they went no further. As for our friends from the East, they managed to raise cabbages from the ploughlands, and that was all. . . ."

Like other peoples, the Finns might have sought a land flowing with milk and honey, but something seems always to have drawn them to the poorest earth, the most ungrateful soil—backwoods and swamps where the frost never quite yields. . . They trusted in their own tough sinews and knew that where the struggle with nature would have broken another man's back it only strengthened the Finns. Their swords were axe and spade. With these they won themselves a land which even their conquerors were forced to recognise as the Finns' own.

Well, it rests with England to decide whether she will be false to her old traditions of honour and the defence of liberty, or whether she will come forward once again in a noble cause, and one which is ultimately bound to win.

PERSIA'S EXTREMITY.

Mr. Bernard Temple.

Persia's independence is in danger of being lost. Some shrewd Persian politicians have told me in bitterness that Persia's independence is already lost. There is no real difference between those two ways of stating the case. If events have not yet led to the subjection of Persia in form they have brought about something closely like subjection in fact. And if any doubt exists as to the imminence of the final issue, not much doubt can exist as to its present apparent inevitableness.

Unless this catastrophic view of Persia's predicament be clearly understood, help will be feeble and futile. Persia's grievances swell into a formidable indictment, but there is a single vital grievance that comprehends and transcends them all—the grievance of impending subjugation. Those friends of Persia in this country who seek to compel attention privately or publicly to incidental grievances of the passing hour may by an unconscious misdirection of regard do harm. Rarely can pressure which is exerted along these restricted lines constrain those in authority to promise redress. More rarely does a promise of redress, when given, materialise in any relief or remedy. And meanwhile the impression spreads that, apart from the particular grievance under discussion, all is well. It is as if the friends of an innocent man whom unjust judges have condemned to the death penalty should busy themselves with questions of the convict's diet and lodgement.

It is unfortunate that opinion in England, so far as it has been awakened, is not guided by fuller knowledge in its generous impulse to befriend Persia. Knowledge is the outcome of close, regular, and constant information. Information is the product of

assiduous study, searching inquiry, and ceaseless vigilance on the spot. No such information is forthcoming. No provision for securing it has been made. There has been some organisation of the political and intellectual forces in this country favourable to Persian aspiration, but the high ability and considerable moral influence thus brought into operation have had to work in the dark. It is not quite a case of conducting a campaign without an intelligence service at the front. It is a case of relying on an irregular and uncertain intelligence service which has brought little into the headquarters camp but vague alarms and confused reports.

Let us here examine a little more definitely the kind and quality of the information usually received. All over Persia, but chiefly in the north, are observant Persians who, like the toad in the proverb, know exactly where each prong of the foreign harrow goes. It is, however, only when a toad is actually suffering that he croaks. It is only of his own particular hurt that he complains. The toad in Tabriz will not cry out when the toad in Meshed is lacerated. All that reaches England from this source as a rule, therefore, is a fitful stream of private implorations. When these individual bursts of Persian anguish move English sympathisers to formal remonstrance, the official reply is usually in the sense that it is difficult to draw a harrow over a field without annoyance to any sort of creature, but in future it is hoped that greater care may be taken to avoid offence. What right the foreign harrow has to be breaking clods in that particular field without the consent and against the wish of the owner of the field is a question no one answers or even asks. Beyond that there is a reluctance in unsympathetic or apathetic quarters in this country to credit at full face value all the information that comes from purely Persian sources. A second principal source of information upon which dependence has to be put is the occasional official publication. No doubt there are Blue-books whose object

was to enlighten the public concerning the subjects discussed. If the Foreign Office Blue-books about the troubles in Persia had such an object they are not very successful. A third and last principal source of information is the Press. This also has regrettable limitations. Teheran swarms with foreign correspondents, but, with one notable exception, I know of none whose aim is not to utilise the resources and opportunities of his position to advance the supposed interests of his own country at whatever expense to the interests of Persia. A diplomatist might be justified in this; not a journalist. The diplomatist executes the will of the nation; the journalist forms the will of the nation. The diplomatist is the steersman; he must keep the course that the skipper sets: the journalist is the look-out man; he must not mislead the skipper by garbled reports.

So far as concerns the representation in Persia of particular English newspapers, the prevailing conception appears to be that English interests in Persia are not now separable journalistically from Russian interests, and that if Russian interests do not consist with Persian interests it is the latter which must yield. As for the one notable exception, the very strictness of its political neutrality puts it out of keeping with its environment. I am referring now to Reuter's news agency, which is nowhere conducted with sounder judgment or more manifest impartiality than in Persia.

Not to be either pro-Persian or anti-Persian, not to be working either on behalf of or in opposition to any foreign country, would be an ideal attitude for a news agency in Teheran if that agency were alone in occupying the field. But partisanship necessitates partisanship. While Reuter tries to hold the journalistic scales in Persia evenly, all the weight of foreign journalistic authority is heaped upon one side of the scales, and equilibrium is lost. That is a state of things which ought not to be allowed to continue. It is time to set up a journalistic counterbalance in Persia; but not of the sort that would

imitate the perversity of the opposing side. Such a *rôle*, biassed and prejudiced, may be left to Persian journalism, which, speaking generally, has all the will and none of the strength to play it. What is wanted is English journalistic representation in Teheran of a sort that will keep the public in this country fully and fairly informed of the march of domestic and foreign affairs and of the significance thereof in what is, if rightly understood, a crisis of world importance.

Meanwhile it falls to me, at the invitation of this Conference, to attempt to throw such light as a traveller may, upon the true nature of Persia's dilemma. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the work of the various societies represented at this Conference to have a very exact idea of either their purpose or their methods. And as I have not the honour to be a member of any of the societies, I shall not presume to suggest a course of action. I shall merely submit certain salient considerations of fact.

At the risk of taking the Conference over very familiar ground, I must, for the sake of completeness of survey, begin with certain simple generalities. No country has ever attained to the altitudes of commercial and political greatness without the advantage of a practicable seaboard. Russia has no such seaboard. She sought it first in the Mediterranean by way of Turkey, and was headed off. She sought it next in the Pacific by way of China, and was again repulsed. She seeks it now in the Persian Gulf by way of Persia. If this resource should fail, no other would remain. There is, therefore, an historical accumulation of intensity in the present quest.

The struggle to reach the Pacific transcended in expenditure of force the struggle to reach the Mediterranean; the struggle to reach the Persian Gulf will transcend the struggle to reach the Pacific. Let us clearly realise that. We shall gain nothing by concealing from ourselves the magnitude and imperiousness of

Russia's purpose. Those who will may discuss the ethics of the position. I am not here to consider whether a mighty empire which has charged herself with the destinies of more than 150,000,000 people can be justified in supplying the supposed vital needs of her growth by despoiling neighbours whom she regards as petty and worthless. I take the facts as I find them.

For reasons which for the most part lie on the surface Russian counsels have not favoured an advance on the Persian Gulf in force. The method called "peaceful penetration" was preferred. It is not because Persia was feeble that this method succeeded so well: it is because Persia was corrupt. Feebleness is a ready prey to violence, not to intrigue. Intrigue conquers only when integrity yields. Had Persia unitedly resisted Russian encroachment with such peaceful means as were at her disposal, Russian devices must have been baffled.

Persia was pawned to Russia by her own Shahs. These rapacious monarchs wanted more money for their profligacy than a misgoverned country could afford, and they also wanted more protection against the indignation of their outraged subjects than their own undisciplined hordes of mercenaries could guarantee. For both money and protection the Shahs turned to Russia. Despots of the worst Asiatic type, they regarded the kingdom as a private estate, and when they had beggared it they pledged its independence for roubles. That pledge Russia holds to-day. Persia, left alone, might be able to redeem the pledge. But Russia will not leave Persia alone, because Russia does not want the pledge redeemed.

What of England? It was at the time when the rich fruits of the "peaceful penetration" had fallen or were falling ripely into Russia's hands that the Anglo-Russian understanding came about. I use the term "understanding" to represent something more comprehensive than the textual Convention of 1907. That understanding expressed from the English standpoint the following body of opinions: That what Russia had

already won in Persia she would be resolute to keep; that much more remained to be won and was plainly coveted; that Persia under the Shahs was too corrupt and demoralised to co-operate with England in an effort for her own salvation; that, short of war on a grand scale, there was therefore no way of dislodging Russia; that in such a war the strategical advantages of position would be enormously in favour of Russia; that the peculiar situation in Europe forbade all present thought of a great international conflict in Asia; that much would be gained if the otherwise irresistible course of Russian encroachment in Persia could be arrested even at its present advanced line; that this consummation could be reached only by entering into an agreement which, while interdicting Russia from further adventure, would admit her right to the position already gained.

If this body of opinions was misconceived, it seems late now to begin searching for error. No one found much fault with it at the time. The extent that the Convention came in for criticism in this country was the view, mildly urged, not that an understanding with Russia was a mistake, or that the basis of this understanding was unsound, but only that the division of the spoils in Persia gave Russia too large and England too small a share. Whether either Power was morally or legally entitled to appropriate what were euphemistically termed "spheres of influence" in a country nominally independent was not admitted into question. If the conscience of England was not shocked then, what should shock it now? It is true that the Convention provided for the maintenance of Persian independence. But if that part of the engagement had meant anything, it would have had to be worded differently—it would have had to provide not for the maintenance but for the restoration of Persian independence. That was an apt cartoon which depicted the British and Russian Foreign Ministers in the solemn act of bolting

and padlocking Persia's stable-door while the Persian horse "Independence" is seen lying in the Russian field trapped in a gin.

Russia, on her part, had good reason to welcome the understanding. Till then Russian encroachment in Persia had lacked every sort of legitimacy and sanction. It had been stealthily pushed on against the growing resentment of the Persian *mullahs* and populace and against the fitful opposition of England. In the face of these antagonisms, which were likely to become stronger rather than weaker, Russian adventure had reached the apparent limits of "peaceful" expansion. It might even have difficulty in holding its ground. If English hostility could now be warded off and Persian protests silenced by a formal legalisation of Russia's position, what had been gained could be consolidated with full confidence in the security of the investment. Not only England and Persia, but, by the implications of international usage, all the world would be drawn, willingly or unwillingly, into acceptation of Russia's predominance in Northern Persia. To renounce further adventure, at a stage when adventure already exceeded safe bounds and was not yet assured of its fruits, was to sacrifice nothing that was immediately attainable; and self-denial binds no nation longer than is meet.

It may thus be said that the Anglo-Russian understanding—considered still in its special relation to Persia—was in substance a truce, not only suspending hostilities, but securing mutual recognition for the positions already occupied, and requiring co-operation in the control of Persian affairs so far as to maintain existing conditions. What the understanding did not seem to foresee was that existing conditions might not be maintainable. Political unrest had already indeed spread in the land, but without assuming a very formidable aspect. The most that the malcontents then claimed was "reform." It looked as if even this modest demand might be successfully resisted. Should that view,

however, be disproved, all trouble, it was believed, could be instantly allayed by a few graceful and empty concessions on the part of the Shah and perhaps the dismissal of one or two unpopular Ministers. The country, apparently, was still securely in the hands of the Shah; the Shah was still inextricably in the toils of Russia.

What a misreading of the signs of the times! What obliviousness of the lessons of history! To think that anyone should interpret the agitation in Persia as a mere revolt against a particular measure or a particular Minister! The true import of the agitation was not long in appearing. It took shape as an awakening and an upheaval of vast democratic forces. Its aim was not to overthrow a despot but to overthrow despotism. It might have been dragooned; it could not be cajoled. All that flattery, fair promise, and stormy threat could do was done then to stem the rising tide of national exasperation and resolve, but the movement was neither to be wheedled nor badgered. It culminated in a revolution more remarkable for its suddenness, its silence, and its bloodlessness than any other in history. That revolution swept away in a moment the abuses, the scandals, the crimes and the cruelties of many centuries' standing. It abolished autocracy; it set up an elected Parliament and a responsible Ministry; it inaugurated a new era of progress; it summoned a loosely-knit group of discordant races and tribes to become a nation; it raised Persia from the dead.

Unfortunately for itself, the revolution did more than that—it excited popular anger and alarm against foreign inroads; it evoked violent outbursts of anti-foreign feeling; it gave early demonstration of a patriotic resolve to sweep away foreign influences and interests in the country; it promulgated a new sentiment with a new watchword, "Persia for the Persians." It thus challenged Russia. The tactical unwisdom of a bellicose attitude at a time when the helpless weakness of Persia called for conciliatory courses is open to the facile

censure of every armchair politician. But it must be remembered that the feeling was not light, nor were its causes trivial. The nation had risen against the Shah, not because he had misgoverned the country, but because he had sold it. The revolution was not to relieve Persia, but to redeem it. Oppression, extortion, and corruption were no new burdens in this unhappy land, and might still be borne by a people singularly patient and submissive; but Russian domination was an unaccustomed infliction exceeding even Persian limits of endurance. A diplomatist can cloak his policy; a general can disguise his strategy; a nation roused cannot veil its passion.

Russia took up the gage. Denunciation of Russia comes glibly to the tongue. Let it be remembered, however, that something more than shadowy ambitions of territorial aggrandisement were now at stake. Russia's vested interests in Persia at that period had become considerable and substantial. They had cost much. They had not yielded much. In character, they were financial, commercial, and strategical. They had grown up unchallenged. They were largely the outcome of the natural advantages of Russia's position and of voluntary concessions made by former Persian Governments. They could not be abandoned.

At the outset of the revolutionary troubles Russia set herself to maintain the Shah, Mohamed Ali, on the throne of an autocrat. It was a course according with self-interest. The Shah, not Persia, was Russia's debtor. Persia might repudiate the debt: the Shah never. Unhappily the Anglo-Russian understanding drew England into association with Russia in the protracted effort which ensued to uphold a wicked king against an incensed people. Clearly the two Powers could not be ranged on opposite sides in Persia's constitutional struggle if the good understanding between them was to continue. What is to be regretted is not that Anglo-Russian concord was maintained, but that it was maintained by subordination of British principles

to Russian interests. I have held intimate converse with scores of informed Persians in various Persian cities, and, as an Englishman, I have found nothing harder to defend than England's participation in Russia's attempts to browbeat the Nationalist leaders at the beginning of the campaign.

It was well for Persia that the Nationalist leaders were not to be overborne by blustering menaces. They advanced, they prevailed, they triumphed. When it is remembered that the Nationalist forces in the field in the hour of their success numbered less than three thousand men it is to be seen that they were brave and daring. But it is also to be seen that they succeeded on sufferance so far as Russia was concerned. No great effort could have been needed to despatch from the Caucasus an overwhelming force of Cossacks to the support of the Shah. That no such aid was sent must be credited to the Anglo-Russian understanding. It is mere justice to say so. British policy in Persia is abundantly open to criticism, but its fairness and its ready firmness in this instance are entitled to the warmest admiration.

Every moral influence had previously been exerted, it is true, to dissuade or deter the Nationalist leaders, but when the resources of diplomacy were seen to have failed the field was frankly held clear for the contestants, and Royalists and Nationalists fought unaided and unhampered. This was the turning-point in the revolution. It counted for more than many people seem willing to admit. Persia owes to it all she has yet won of freedom. In a sense which perhaps only those who were in Persia during the last stages of the revolution can fully understand, not the Sipahdar, nor the Sardar Assad, but Sir Edward Grey was Persia's deliverer.

Only while the fight lasted was the field held clear. As soon as the fight finished the ring was mobbed. The Nationalists had won; they must be prevented from enjoying the fruits of victory. Because those fruits

were understood to involve the decline of Russian influence in Persia, the weakening of Russian control, the depreciation of Russian interests, and the frustration of Russian ambitions. In decency the new Nationalist Government could not be incontinently crushed, but it must be gradually paralysed. Its prestige at home and abroad must be undermined, its useful activities must be trammelled or perverted, its plans and purposes must be misrepresented. Painful and disquieting has been the success of these various machinations. How much is directly chargeable against Russian Ministers at home, how much against Russian representatives in Persia, and how much against Russian journalists in both countries, is a question that the casuists of the chancelleries may be left to settle.

What concerns us is that Persian Nationalism is being stealthily choked. So heavily lies the Russian shadow upon the country that the political gloom seems deeper to-day than when Mohamed Ali still sat upon the throne. The Tehran Government finds itself enmeshed in tangles of diplomatic relationship which are none of its weaving. It sees itself forced from outside into the position of being unable to raise money because it cannot introduce reforms. It beholds Russian troops, under the hollowest pretexts, permanently quartering themselves in Persian cities and outraging Persian rights. It sees disorder and sedition sown under its very eyes in order to discredit the new *régime*. It watches with forced forbearance persistent efforts to divide the Parliament against itself and even to divide the Cabinet against itself. In brief, it feels the foreign grip tightening.

Is it not sad that the Anglo-Russian understanding should involve England in the semblance of complicity in these anti-Nationalist devices? Is it not positively deplorable that British morality should thus seem to be in political subjection to Russian expediency? But it is more than a matter of sentiment. All that England's constancy did in 1909, England's inconstancy is undoing

in 1910. What further embitters the irony of the situation is that the two Powers, while making a show of abstaining from intervention, under the terms of the Convention, are so ordering the affairs of Persia as to make intervention inevitable. The day of that irreparable calamity may not be very near, but it cannot be very distant. Ere it betide, now is the time for friends of Persia to exert unitedly all their powers of intercession and protection. I would ask such friends not to dwell overmuch on the particularities of Russian high-handedness. There is no time for that. Doubtless unjust and overbearing proceedings must rouse indignation. But it is a poor service to a nation which is being strangled to insist that the strangling shall be done more gently.

Persia appeals to the whole civilised world to be allowed to live. She has a right to live. She has records of an illustrious past. She has hopes of a glorious future. Her contributions to the world's thought and work have been unique. The world still has need of her. England is, in however informal a sense, trustee to the world for Persia's independence. The world does not realise yet how perilously the trust is being administered. Still further is the world from realising how much more than even the fate of Persia lies at stake. The supreme issue indeed raises a question of elemental human justice between Europe as a whole and Asia as a whole. A time is clearly coming when all the countries in the West and all the countries of the East will have to be parties to that great cause. In anticipation, perhaps, of that time, England has in recent years been showing herself sedulous to lay the foundation of world peace.

The only foundation upon which world peace can abide is justice.

It is for this Conference, I would submit, to do what lies in its power to prevent an irrevocable injustice from being done to Persia. And the time for doing is now.

THE TREATY RIGHTS OF GEORGIA

Mr. Michel Tseretheli

(*Translation given in Appendix*)

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs,—Vous venez d'entendre la parole de la représentante de la Finlande, de cette dernière victime que la domination russe a l'intention de supprimer et de rayer de la liste des nations civilisées de l'Europe.

Malheureusement le despotisme russe ne compte pas seulement la Finlande parmi ses victimes, mais aussi la Pologne, la Georgie et les autres. Le représentant de la grande nation polonaise, de ce pays qui a ouvert l'ere de l'émancipation de l'esprit moderne en donnant Copernic a l'Europe, de cette nation dechírée politiquement et humilée nationalement par trois monstres, vous dira lui même ce que son peuple a eu à endurer de ses oppresseurs. Et moi, j'ai l'honneur de parler devant vous au nom du peuple Géorgien dont la cause est si simple et en même temps si important au point de vue du droit international, que je ne vous demande que quelques minutes d'attention, et de profonde attention, en espérant que ce meeting formulera l'opinion qui empechtera dans l'avenir la répétition des actes de l'injustice pareils à celui que le gouvernement russe a commis envers les Géorgiens.

Pendant plus de vingt siècles la Géorgie formait un royaume indépendant, chrétien et civilisé. Pressée de tous les côtés par les ennemis innombrables elle combattu deux milles ans pour sa liberté, pour sa religion et pour son indépendance. Extenuée et fatiguée de la lutte continuelle elle a été reduite à chercher l'alliance et la protection de son voisin Chrétien l'Empire Russe. Le

traité d'alliance et du protectorat a été conclu entre le Roi de Géorgie, Irakli II. et l'Impératrice de toutes les Russies Catherine II. en 1783. Ainsi la Géorgie a pu apporter le drapeau de son indépendance jusqu'à la fin des XVIII. siècle et si à ce moment critique elle céderit son droit de la souveraineté au grand Empire, ce n'était que pour vivre en paix avec tous ses voisins.

Ce qui est arrivé après la conclusion du traité de 1783, vous verrez, mesdames et messieurs, de l'extrait de notre pétition nationale addressée par le comité Anglais—"Georgian Relief Committee"—à la conférence Internationale de la Haye tenue in 1907. Le voici cet extrait: (*La lecture de la Pétition*).*

Comme vous avez vu, mesdames et messieurs, notre ambassadeur en St. Petersbourg protesta énergiquement contre la violation du traité et quitta immédiatement la capitale de l'Empire Russe. La protestation a été suivie par toute la nation et la Géorgie de l'Est a recouru à son moyen traditionnel, aux armes, hélas! cette fois contre les alliés d'hier. Mais les troupes imperiales inondait déjà la Géorgie pour l'occuper définitivement, pour en faire ensuite la base de ses opérations militaires, pour conquérir le Caucase tout entier et pour porter des coups mortels à la puissance politique de Perse et de la Turquie. Les conséquences de ces actes sont même actuellement sensiblement eprouvées par ces deux puissances! Le peuple Géorgien ne se resigna jamais. En 1804, 1812, 1830, 1848, 1878 le mouvement national se manifestait en révoltes, écrasées d'ailleurs par les troupes russes avec une brutalité indéscriptible. Mais ce qui est plus intérressant encore, c'est l'esprit social qui animait toujours le mouvement national Géorgien. Le peuple ne demandait pas seulement la reconstitution de son autonomie nationale, mais aussi les droit de l'homme et du citoyen.

Et ce double caractère du mouvement Géorgien se montra plus clairement encore dans la révolution de

* A translation of the petition is given in the Appendix.

1904-5. Alors la nation toute entière aspirait à l'autonomie nationale et au régime démocratique, les classes laboureuses aux libertés politiques, à l'emancipation économique et à la solidarité internationale. Le mouvement Gèorgien de 1904-5 se produisait en parfaite solidarité avec le mouvement russe, polonais, finlandais etc., mais, comme vous le savez bien, il a éte écrasé encore une fois pa la réaction toute-puissante qui sévit en Russie jusqu'à l'heure actuelle. Toute la Géorgie a été brulée, ruinée, détruite à coup de canons par les hordes sauvages des cosaques et des soldats.

La nation était en deuil et en desespoir, et c'est dans ces conditions lamentables que nous nous sommes recourus à la justice internationale. C'est à ce moment, en 1907 que nous avons formulé notre pétition présentée à la conférence de la Haye par le "Georgian Relief Committee." La pétition a produit une profonde impression sur les membres de la Conférence, mais ils n'ont pas pu la discuter parcqu'elle n'a pas été inscrite dans le programme de la Conférence.

Maintenant nous avons décidé de porter notre cause devant l'opinion publique du monde civilisé.

Nous sommes convaincus que cette opinion publique doit et peut avoir l'influence sur le droit international qui n'est malheurevement à l'heure actuelle que le serviteur des intérêts des grandes puissances, mais qui doit être dans l'avenir le défenseur de toutes les nations, grandes ou petites, civilisées ou demi-civilisées.

En théorie du moins le droit international a proclamé l'égalité de tous les états. Par ce grand principe de l'égalité la Russie et le Monténégre ont les mêmes droits. L'heure n'est pas loin, nous espérons, où la morale internationale, où une nouvelle conception du droit international proclamera l'égalité de toutes les nations. Déjà à 1850 un internationaliste Italien Pasquale Stanislao Mancini enseignait que c'est l'idée de la nation qui est fondementale et que l'idée de l'état n'est que sa derivée. Le seul sujet du droit inter-

national droit être la nation et non pas l'état. L'Europe a vu réaliser en partie la théorie de Mancini. Les nations subjuguées par l'Empire Ottoman, la patrie même de Mancini, l'Italie, conquirent leur indépendances, et le droit international était obligé de les reconnaître comme états indépendants et de les prendre sous sa protection. Depuis lors l'idée du droit international juste et vraiment *international* marche et, ensemble avec le grande idée de l'émancipation sociale des peuples, il mine l'impérialisme, car les peuples en sont fatigués, ils en ont assez!

Mesdames et messieurs, vous avez fait probablement attention à un phénomène extremement significatif dont vous êtes temoins: moi, représentant d'une nation qui ne compte que 3 millions individus, Mme. Malmberg, représentante d'une nation qui compte un peu plus que la nation Georgienne,—et nous voilà à coté du représentant d'une nation qui compte 250 millions! Et nous sommes tous egaux ici devant vous, devant le monde civilisé. Le monde civilisé, le droit international juste doit nous accorder les droits égaux! Et bien, mesdames et messieurs, c'est à la naissance d'une nouvelle conception du droit international que nous assistons peut être ici. Et lorsque ce nouveau droit international prendra sous sa protection toutes les nations, comme des individualités historiques, comme des vraies personnes juridiques, enfin comme des seuls organismes sociaux vivants,—c'est alors qu'il sera vrai défenseur de la liberté et de la paix universelle, c'est alors qu'il deviendra un vrai droit international, c'est alors que l'organisation que le grand internationaliste allemand Bluntchli révait encore et qu'il croyait possible.

En attendant, c'est de la solidarité et de l'action commune de toutes les nations opprimées que dépend leur réintégration dans leur justes droits et aussi bien la réalisation de la grande idée de la liberté de toutes les nations et l'établissement des relations pacifiques entre elles.

Legislative Library
Ontario.

RUSSIAN MIS-RULE IN GEORGIA

Prince W. Tcherkesoff

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The sittings of the Conference to-day are entirely devoted to the grievances and demands of four nations —Finland, Georgia, Poland, and Persia. And it should be noted that all their complaints are directed against the policy of oppression, of ruin, and even of massacre of the Imperial, autocratic government of Russia.

You have heard the speech of Madame Malmberg. She has told you how, in the extreme north of the Empire, in Finland, the Tsar and his Government, in spite of international treaties, of solemn Imperial manifestoes, and of the oaths of four successive Emperors guaranteeing the faithful carrying out of these treaties, have destroyed constitutional order in that highly-cultured and civilised country.

What is now being done by the Russian Government in Finland has already been accomplished in the extreme south-east of the Empire, in Georgia. From my friend and compatriot's speech, and after hearing the petition which was presented to the Hague Conference in 1907, you have learned that Georgia—an independent kingdom for twenty centuries—in 1801 entered into a treaty of voluntary annexation with Russia. This treaty recognised the autonomy of the Georgian Government, and guaranteed the maintenance of the national Courts of Justice, the coinage, the military system, and of the autonomous Church. Well, none of the conditions were carried out; we have lost everything, and we are one of the most oppressed of the nations of the Russian Empire. If we mention the treaty and its obligations the Ministers of the Tzar insolently tell us that as the

Tsar of Russia is an autocrat he may govern as he pleases, and that he is not bound by treaties, oaths, laws, or institutions.

Quite recently the Prime Minister, Stolypin, repeated in the Duma this outrageous conception of international law. It seems that the Russian Government intends to introduce even into international politics this doctrine of non-observance of treaties with small nations: the events in Persia are the best illustration of this tendency. If European democracy does not put a stop to this attempt by vigorous action a greater danger threatens all liberty and even modern civilisation.

I bring this accusation against the Russian Government not only as a member of an oppressed nationality, but especially as one who has taken part in the great movement of emancipation in Russia. For forty-five years my Russian comrades and I have denounced the policy of our oppressors as barbarous and cruel.

Everywhere, even among the most enlightened and advanced nations, there is misery and suffering. But in Russia, with the exception of four millions out of a population of 140 millions, the whole mass of the people is dragging on an existence of slavery and starvation. According to the report of a Senatorial Commission, nineteen provinces of Central Russia, with a population of about forty millions, are completely ruined; the economic conditions of the peasants in those parts are worse than at the time of the abolition of serfdom in 1861. The average mortality in Russia exceeds 32 per 1,000, while in Norway it is only 14.7 per 1,000. At the same time the Government does all it can to prevent the spread of education—in 1904 there were fourteen million children of school age without public instruction. Any attempts at helping the poor or educating the peasants are suppressed, and many thousand young men have been imprisoned and even deported to Siberia for being guilty of those crimes of love and mercy.

In order that you may have an idea to which degree the Government has brought the rebarbarisation of laws and institutions I will give you the statistics of public executions for the last four years. From 1856 to 1904 there were only 407 executions in Russia, including those who suffered during the Polish insurrection of 1863. But during the last four years more than 3,000 executions have taken place; 37,000 persons have been killed in the pogroms, and altogether there have been 68,000 victims of the present atrocious *régime*.

Conditions of life during the last four years have been so hard that there have been 10,186 cases of suicide. In 1905 there were only 85 cases of suicide, and in 1908 there were 4,036 cases!

If the Tsar and his Ministers have created so much misery in their own nation, it is easily understood how they treated subject nations and what will be the fate of the Finnish people.

For the last six years Georgia, especially its western provinces, bears the aspect of a country invaded and conquered by savage hordes. Numerous villages as Aketi, Ḳvirila, Osurgheti, Bandza were entirely destroyed; others like Koutaïs, the chief town of Western Georgia, were partially burned down; gardens and vineyards were purposely destroyed and the cattle slaughtered or carried off. Under the pretext of punitive expeditions Cossacks and their officers live by plundering the Georgian population, which in many places is ruined and starved. Without speaking of the Cossacks and soldiers who were openly selling on the market place of Koutaïs their loot, the newspapers of Moscow and St. Petersburg have stated that soldiers and Cossacks have sent to their villages hundreds and thousands of roubles which they obtained by plunder. Officers, and even generals—such as Bauer, Alikanoff, Gavriloff, Tolmotcheff, Kriloff, and many others—when they attended the receptions of the Viceroy (Count Vorontzoff-Dashkoff) wore daggers, and swords of great value,

which had been pillaged from Georgian villages. In order to humiliate and definitely crush us, Georgian officials were dismissed from the administration, and after a diabolical plan in order to provoke religious hatred, their places were filled by Mussulmans, mostly illiterate, who know not a word of Georgian and even very little Russian. The Viceroy, with M. Stolypin's consent, made these men understand that they can act as they please; they may plunder and oppress at their will; and really during the last three years the rural police have committed incredible outrages on the peasants. Even at Tiflis, the capital of Georgia, the high police officials organised burglaries, levied blackmail, and kidnapped the children of rich men in order to demand ransoms.

No less cruel and oppressive have been the civil and ecclesiastical administrations. The Georgian language is one of the oldest in the world, and, according to linguistic specialists like A. H. Rawlinson, F. Lenormant, H. Sayee, etc., the only surviving branch of the ancient Sumero-Alarvdian, and is now again being studied by modern scientists: this language is, by order of the Tsar, rigorously proscribed in the Courts, in the schools, and even in the churches. The Government has gone so far in its persecution as to prohibit Georgian in kindergartens where children from 4 to 5 years of age attend, and the clergy have been forbidden to give the name of our national saints to children at christening. When the clergy tried to defend the rights of their church—which has been independent since the eighth century—they were ill-treated and beaten by Cossacks and by the police even near the palace of the Viceroy. The most learned and respected of them, like Bishop Cirion and Abbot Ambrosius, have been deposed and imprisoned in monasteries in the extreme north of Russia, where they are treated as criminals. All the property of the Georgian Church, valued at sixty million roubles, as well as its revenues of two million roubles a

year, have been appropriated by the Imperial Russian Government.

Perhaps the most revolting policy is the economic ruin of our nation carried on by the Russian Government. Our national property is seized by the Imperial Treasury, and is distributed among the favourites of the Court and high officials, whilst our agricultural population, especially in the central and western provinces, is suffering from a land famine. And in spite of all this we have to contribute eight million roubles a year to the Imperial Treasury, though not a rouble of that money is spent in our country. On the contrary, our peasants have to keep their oppressors at their own expense. Land is taken away from the peasants and is given to the agents of Russification. A few weeks ago 450 peasants of a village near Soukhoum were driven out of their homes—their fields, gardens, and vineyards were sequestered—without any compensation, by order of the Governor with the approval of the Viceroy, Count Vorontzoff, and the Prime Minister, M. Stolypin.

In this short speech I have not been able to deal with all aspects of the Georgian question. I have only quoted some isolated cases of the ruinous and oppressive policy of the Tsar's Government. I should need volumes to enumerate all the grievances of my nation, and only an International Commission could reveal all the revolting acts of barbarism committed, which would make civilised people blush.

My fellow-citizens have often asked me if it were not possible to inform the civilised nations of Europe of all these facts so that they might exercise pressure on the Russian Government and compel it to carry out the provisions of the treaty. With this object we presented the petition to The Hague Conference in 1907. The representatives of the Powers did not dare discuss this petition. Then I was asked to call the attention of enlightened public opinion to our wrongs by laying our case before your International Conference. Therefore I

ask you to help us either by the Press or by the action of Members of Parliament, so that the Government of the Tsar may be compelled to observe the Treaty of alliance and protection voluntarily entered into by the kingdom of Georgia and the Russian Empire, and to restore to our nation its national lands, its autonomous government, and its independent church, as was guaranteed a century ago by " Our Imperial Word " of the Emperor of all the Russias.

THIRD SESSION

IRELAND AND POLAND

Mr. R. B. Cunninghame Graham, who took the chair for the discussion on Ireland and Poland, spoke at considerable length on the general subjects of Imperialism and the suppression of nationality, which, in his opinion, were both detrimental to the world's progress and happiness. The greater part of his speech, after the enumeration of the Empires at present busy either in the extermination of races or the mutilation of nationalities, was devoted to the present-day wrongs of India and Egypt. He declared that so far as he could judge from personal experience European civilisation had proved an unmitigated curse to every so-called inferior race which had come in contact with it. It was, he thought, no use dwelling on the exterminated people—we should direct our attention to the mutilated nations, of which Ireland was the nearest example. When, he told his audience, he was undergoing penal servitude as a Member of the House of Commons, he always voted with the Irish Members, and were he there now he would do so again. He had heard of a new movement in Ireland other than on the old Parliamentary lines—a movement to build up or revive a distinct Irish civilisation, with its arts, its language, its industries, and its social life. If the peasants of Ireland were one-half so rich in interest as one was led to believe by seeing the Abbey Theatre plays, he for one would wish such a movement God-speed. He then called on the Hon. William Gibson, who sat on his right hand in the picturesque national Irish dress of saffron kilt and mantle flung like a plaid across the shoulders, to state the case of Ireland.

[The speeches of this session were unavoidably curtailed owing to the great length of the previous session on the same afternoon.]

IRELAND'S GREATEST NEED

The Hon. William Gibson, speaking first in Irish (in which language his greeting to the chair was courteously acknowledged by his fellow Gael, Mr. Cunninghame Grahame), said:—

I use the Irish language because it is my national language. Irish is as much the national language of Ireland as Polish is of Poland or German of Germany, and we Irish will never be satisfied until it is used always and as a matter of course wherever Irishmen meet. At an international gathering like this, however, I propose that we should use French, not only because it is the language of Western civilisation, but as a language in many ways akin to our own, built up, as it was, by our brother Gaels through a blending of the old Gaelic, which they never quite lost, with the Latin, which they never quite assimilated.

Mr. Gibson, then speaking in French, went on to say: I am now speaking in French partly as a protest against the idea that English is the language of international relations, or, so far as the Irish are concerned, the language of freedom, but as it appears that there are many present totally ignorant of French, I shall conclude my speech in "the tongue of the stranger," as English is to this day called in Ireland, much as I dislike the language. But I must remind my hearers that there is only one use an Irishman could have for this tongue, and that is to lay it about the back of the stranger himself.

(So saying, Mr. Gibson began to speak in English.)

There is one language which has been a persecution to me ever since my earliest childhood. It has done serious damage to my mouth, tongue, throat, and

organs of respiration, and nothing but the very strongest sense of duty could induce me to speak it now, because if Irishmen wish really to be men, they must be Irish and not bad imitations of other people. This stressing the value of a nation's language is no new thing, and it is not only small nations, but great ones too, that have had in most cases at some time or other in the course of their history to face their language problem. It was Chaucer who decided that the English people should speak English, not Norman-French, and it is the few men who founded the Gaelic League in Ireland who are saving the Irish language and the soul of the Irish people. The Gaelic League is, as probably everyone knows, a non-political body, and its members when on Gaelic League platforms are not politicians. But let no one deceive himself by thinking that there are no politicians among the Gaelic Leaguers, because there are, and off that non-political platform they are, like myself, very ardent politicians indeed. In this struggle for the national language of Ireland we shall win, because we intend to win. I have much joy in declaring to the representatives of the small nations here assembled that no power on earth could stand in the way of a nation if the individuals composing that nation became free in their souls.

FAILURE OF IMPERIALISM IN IRELAND

Mr. G. Gavan Duffy, after thanking those Englishmen who, in promoting the movement, had courageously stood up in defence of liberty against the overwhelming voice of their countrymen, said that the purpose of the meeting had been misinterpreted in some quarters. They were not there to bewail the errors or to condemn the mistakes of Imperialism in the past with a view to making it less ignoble in the future. They had met to make a dignified protest against all the pretentions of a spurious empire worship, and against all Imperialism—be it good or bad (it was worst when it appeared good). They set up the natural right, vested in every distinct nationality to be master of its own affairs.

Ireland was in a worse position than other victims of English jingoism. In other cases, war was openly declared; the "conquest" was held by sheer force; the oppressed knew exactly what they had to face. In Ireland this stage had been successfully passed by the English garrison, and the final stage of subjection had been inaugurated in the nineteenth century. The most insidious and persistent attempt had been made to build upon the shattered ruins of Irish manhood, an English fastness manned by the young blood of Ireland. Nothing had been left undone to train the young mind in the profoundest contempt for things native and in the loftiest admiration for all the exotic verdure of a foreign empire. The years of physical dejection had been well utilised to sap the character of Ireland, but a new movement based on self-reliance had come in the nick of time to undo the evil work of those who had

sought to emasculate the Irish nation by teaching little Irish boys and girls to be good little English children without a spark of pride or patriotism.

But be it England's imperial yoke or any other that they considered, be the body or the mind of the subject enslaved, or both, they would find Imperialism the same at heart everywhere. Imperialism should be ended, for it could not be mended, and, so far as England was concerned, their unanimous message from this great international gathering, held in the citadel of the British Empire, must be: "Hands off the throat of Egypt; hands off the throat of India; hands off the throat of Ireland!"

POLAND, THE NIOBE OF NATIONS

THE REV. W. LACK-SZYRMA

I AM asked to speak to you to-day on that Niobe of nations, the great nationality, once one of the great Powers of Europe—Poland.

The time was when Poland was the chief Christian nation of Eastern Europe, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, the great bulwark of Europe against the savagery of the Tartars and Turks of Asia. Much larger than France, it is now divided among three European Powers, and is a subject nationality. The difficulty of the restoration of Poland lies in the fact that Russia, Prussia, and Austria are all three sharers in the plunder. Austria, however, has been more lenient of late.

Many of the subject nationalities are small peoples suffering because of the unjust theory that " minorities must suffer," but the Poles are a nation of some sixteen millions.

Now the great family of the European nations is divided into four:—

1. The *Latins* and *Greeks* of the Mediterranean shores.

2. The *Celtic* nations of the six great divisions—the Goidels, Irish, Highlanders, Manx, Brythons, Bretons, Welsh, and Cornish. To these we add the Belgæ or Walloons.

3. The *Germanic* races—Anglo-Saxons, Germans, Scandinavians.

4. The *Slavonians*. To these the Poles belong; also Bohemians, Russians with Tartar blood mixed, and the

South Slavonians; Bulgarians, Servians, Montenegrins, etc., now so much to the fore.

I may say the Polish Jews are Semites and not connected with the Slavonians. I respect Jews, but they are not Poles.

Of the Slavonians, the question has been, which is the dominant nation? The Bulgarians were a great nation, and had Tsars. The Bohemian has sometimes stood forth as a leading nation, but the Czechs were not very prominent. The Moravian nation once was very powerful. The Poles, during much of the Middle Ages, from 1300 and on to the time of Sobieski, were most prominent in Europe.

The Russians, by their combined action and docility to their Tsars, have at length obtained a supremacy.

The foundation of the Polish nation was laid about 1,000 years ago, in the time of King Alfred. The Piast Dynasty was then established, but about 1000 A.D. Boleslaw the Great and Mievsyslaw placed Poland among the Christian nations of Europe. About the time of the Norman Conquest Poland annexed Silesia and Pomerania, and became an independent nation holding its own against the German Empire.

The kingdom of Poland was, however, finally established under the wonderful dwarf king, Ladislaw Lopietek, a very small man but a great warrior. About this period the dwarf king and his son Casimer III. established much of the constitution of Poland, just while under Edward I. the constitution of England was being established. In fact, in some points the histories of England and Poland are parallel. Both were constitutional monarchies, and their free institutions offended the tyrants, whose subjects fled to Poland and England for liberty. But, alas! Poland had not "the streak of silver sea" to guard her frontiers, and in the end the tyrants have been able to wreak their vengeance on one of these free nations.

I need hardly remind you of the great services Poland

has done for human culture and science. The Jews were protected from their persecutors by the Polish Government when afflicted everywhere else. In astronomy, Copernicus, of Thom, was the discoverer of the nature of our solar system; and recently it was a Polish lady, Mme. Curie, who discovered radium, the greatest scientific discovery any woman made. Paderewski, the greatest of pianists, was a Pole; Chopin was half a Pole; Sienkiewicz, whose "Quo Vadis" is so celebrated, Mickiewicz, a great poet, and also Slowachi, were all Poles.

In war there was John Sobieski who saved Vienna and Europe from the Turk; Koscveusho, whose monument was unveiled at Washington; Koscuisho, whose mound is at Cracus; Pulashi, whose statue also is at Washington; Bem; Dombrowshi, and a score of other generals came from Poland.

At the funerals of Queen Victoria and Edward VII. Chopin's Funeral March was played. This march was composed in memory of the Fall of Poland. The world of European culture would have been much poorer had it not been for the Poles.

But the infamous crime of the Partition of Poland has not been without its punishment. Without the recognition of the autonomy of the Polish nation Europe has lost its balance, and the true balance of power has become impossible. France has suffered through this. Twice she might have been saved from defeat by restoring Poland: Napoleon I., had he restored Poland, would have been saved the Moscow Retreat; Napoleon III., had he restored Poland during the Crimean War, need not have been crushed at Sedan, and he would have had a powerful ally on the east of Prussia.

England, had she restored Poland after the Crimean War, might have saved herself millions of pounds, and been far safer in India and the East. Germany even has lost by Poland's being divided, for it would have been a useful buffer state to keep off the Cossack.

Since the great crime of the tri-partition of Poland the equilibrium of Europe has been lost, and it is only by its restoration that the true balance can be regained and peace secured.

Other oppressed nations that fifty years ago seemed hopeless have regained their liberty. Italy was once a "mere geographical expression." Now by the help of Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour, and other Italian patriots, it is one of the great Powers of Europe.

Hungary, in Kossuth's time, was enslaved and oppressed, now it is a great nation.

Greece has been restored as an independent state.

Bulgaria was a province of Turkey, now it is a kingdom, and its Czar rode in King Edward's funeral throng through London. Not long ago Bulgaria's cause was even more hopeless than Poland's.

The past cruelties to the Poles under Russia, the tortures of Siberia, the prison and the knout, awake the sympathy of all.

But there is now some hope from the Russian Duma —the Parliament of the new Russian constitution. Only lately, though the Zemstvo case was given against the Poles, the majority was not great. The Polish M.P.'s speak well, and great wrongs may move even Russian Deputies to do justice.

As for Germany, the Prussian Government is efficient in many matters, but represses the Polish language, and tries to plant Germans in Great Poland. History will record this treatment of Poland as the gravest crime committed by Prussia in this twentieth century.

The Austrian Government is more liberal to Galicia, and the Poles and Bohemians have some power in the Reichsrath.

The Polish Congress at Washington last month was an event of importance. If Polish life is repressed at home it has expression in the lands of the free—in America, in France, in England.

In the Western States and in Canada there are tens

of thousands of Polish exiles who enjoy liberty in the great American land. In France there are also thousands of Poles who have fled from tyranny. In London, even, we have not a few of all classes, and some useful societies which keep up the light of Polish nationality. But nothing will satisfy Poland but justice and autonomy at home. For this I plead with all friends of liberty and justice to give us their sympathy and aid.

The question may suggest itself to some members of this Conference, " What can I do to help obtain justice for Poland?"

There are four ways I should like to suggest:—

1. By supporting one or other of our Polish societies, *e.g.*, " The Literary Association of Friends of Poland," which has gone on for seventy-eight years since the revolution of 1832; the Polish Club and the Polish Circle.

2. By defending the Polish cause and clearing public opinion.

3. By supporting M.P.'s who are friendly to the cause of liberty.

4. By recognising the services of Poland to the cause of civilisation and culture.

I do not hope for anything for Poland from war. We have had enough war in days gone by. A peaceful means will, I trust, in time bring about justice. But for justice to Poland I would plead in the name of common humanity.

FOURTH SESSION

The subject of the Fourth Session of the Conference, held on the evening of Wednesday, June 29th, was "Slavery and Forced Labour in Africa, Mexico, Peru," etc. The Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bt., M.P. (in the chair), opened the Session by speaking on "Forced and Indentured Labour."

FORCED AND INDENTURED LABOUR IN SOUTH AMERICA

Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke

The development of tropical intensity of culture in South and Central America is likely to exceed in scale that opening of Africa which hitherto has attracted the more attention. There is reason, historians think, to modify the opinion long entertained as to the degree of cruelty which accompanied the Spanish conquest of the Indians of the Latin America of our day. The most recent inquirers have, indeed, come to the conclusion that, after the first horrors of the conquest, a higher standard prevailed among the Spanish rulers of America than is presented in the present day by large parts of Africa and the furthest East.

In Mexico a powerful Republic—stable under the dictatorship of autocratic Presidents of Indian or mixed race—is accused of habitually practising enslavement of the labour in the more remote portions of the Mexican territory.

It is difficult to be sure of the facts in such unreachable forests as those of Yucatan. The allegation that the growers of sisal hemp in Yucatan have practised chattel slavery resolves itself on inquiry into a system of debt pledge. It seems certain, however, that when the estates change hands the purchase money includes a large sum for the debt slaves, and that they (the slaves) are unpaid, beaten, and systematically worked out. The Southern Provinces of Mexico have,

however, never been well known, and the scale of development of trade which there obtains is comparatively unimportant by the side of the problem presented in the north part of the South American continent by the valley of the Amazon.

Already the tributaries of the Amazon are bringing through Brazil a vast supply of rubber, in which that Portuguese Republic bids fair to take the first place long since attained by her in coffee. Many governments meet of which come the tributary streams to join those flowing in the vast tropical plain from the south and north from the Andes of Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia. Not only tropical produce, but minerals are likely in an increasing degree to reach us from or through Brazil. The province of Minas Geraes contains a store of iron probably as great as that which exists in the whole of North America; and, though it is as yet untouched, the future development of the minerals of South America, known and unknown, seems certain to be stupendous. There is, indeed, reason to imagine that South America has resources not far short of those that belong to the whole of the rest of the habitable globe. In no part is development of trade more rapidly proceeding.

From a tributary of the Amazon flowing through a valley quite close to the Pacific coast, in a territory disputed between Peru and Colombia, and perhaps Ecuador, has come a tale of cruelties inflicted by the agents of a company having its seat in London so grave as to cause the representation of our Foreign Office by Mr. Roger Casement, now Consul-General in Brazil, at the sittings of a committee despatched by the company to make inquiry on the spot. True or not true, the rumour illustrates the extent to which penetration of that which was till recent years the largest unknown tropical territory in the world has already been accomplished by the resources of European capital. Colombia is one of the least known of the South American Republics, but its back country has already for some

years been traversed by railways chiefly owned in Great Britain or in France. The future of labour in the growth or collection from the soil of tropical produce is at least as important as that presented by the equally difficult but better known problems of Africa.

In the south and west of Columbia, in the west of Ecuador, in north-western Peru, in the whole of Bolivia, and in the greater portion of Brazil, as well as in the other valleys where tributaries of the Rio de la Plata flow southward from southern Bolivia and Brazil, through Paraguay, we have a territory enormous even on the African scale, and unlike Africa, containing little or no hopeless desert. The inhabitants of these remoter tracts are all Indian. The Spaniards or the Portuguese of unmixed race are there as few as are the European settlers; the infiltration even of negro blood is small; and the distinctions which undoubtedly exist, and are often supposed to be of race, are in fact only between Indians, who are Catholic and speak Spanish, and Indians, who are grouped by other Indians as "savages." The Church of Spain has left her mark, while that of Bolivia and other South American Liberators predominant in the cities of the coast is imperceptible among the Indians of the interior.

Brazil has kept pace with the more southern and less tropical Argentina in the production of eminent statesmen and administrators, and similar progress may in time be expected from Peru, Colombia, and the rest. But even the high civilisation which the Brazilian Republic has now reached is hardly yet to be recognised on the Upper Amazon. The only forest district of South America to which anything in the nature of modern government has penetrated is that territory at the back of Paraguay, in which, as the result of wars, Argentina has obtained a footing in a back country formerly disputed between Bolivia and Brazil and Paraguay—the territory of the Chaco.

The best evidence as to the need for extreme

watchfulness and anxiety in respect of the cultural development of this enormous tract is to be obtained from accounts by scientific travellers written without an eye to the class of questions that interest us here. The reports made by administrators to their employers—whether companies or Governments—and by these published to the world, are naturally open to suspicion. The incidental references in the books of men who journey to collect the butterflies or the orchids of the Upper Amazon, or in papers read by explorers or students of folk-lore and primitive customs, are more worthy of comparison and acceptance. Unfortunately, British companies are connected with some of the worst examples of oppression. It is the unexpected incidental references to such cases in the records of scientific exploration that are the most trustworthy and the most terrible. In Peru, in Brazil, and in Bolivia there has been such connection. Even at the Royal Geographical Society we find great men of science accepting from their colleagues, Spanish, Portuguese, and South Americans, the certainty of the absolute disappearance of "the savage," by which term is meant, as in Formosa—where we condemn the Japanese for their cruelty—the wiping out of the aboriginal peoples.

British company directors have been attacked for abominable conditions on rubber plantations in the valleys of the Andes, in the back country of Brazil and a valley disputed between Colombia and Peru, and within the boundaries of Bolivia, Ecuador, etc. The particular cases cannot be mentioned here, and the facts in several are disputed. But there can be no doubt as to the general conditions prevailing in one of the largest regions of the globe that is still virtually unknown. There are immense tracts where shooting at sight is still the rule, and where exploration has hardly been attempted. We may trust the facts brought out on three occasions by the reading at the Royal Geographical Society of papers by explorers who have either

skirted the fringes of these countries or, by passing through them at certain points, have run great risks and in one case themselves engaged in war. The papers have each time been read in the presence of those who best know the country, and on two occasions in the presence of representatives of the Legations of the Powers concerned.

It is unhappily the case that in the discussions on the papers it became clear that we are in face of a state of things in North-Central South America which rivals that in the Congo, both by the horrors perpetrated and by the scale of area affected. To give but one instance, there was a paper read by Mr. Hamilton Rice, and published in the *Geographical Journal* for June, 1910, in which Mr. Rice refutes, with full knowledge, an attack made upon the savage people of those countries behind Brazil which the Portuguese and their Indians entered from the east. He tells us that Mr. A. R. Wallace, in relating his travels on the tributaries of the Amazon, described "the third race," as it is now called, of South America, in contrast to the whites and the Indians—"the savages"—as cannibals of the worst type. In the official writings of the Baptist Missions of South America, where there exists British settlements of British origin, speaking only Spanish, but clinging to their old Protestant creed, we have had accounts of the "unreached savage," who, as contrasted with the Indian and the white, has lain beyond the influence of "Rome." But ethnologically there is no dividing line to be drawn in South America between the white, the Indian, and the savage. The so-called whites are largely Indian, the Indians are largely negro, and the savages are partly Indian, partly negro, and partly an amalgam of races older in the country than the principal Indian tribes.

This is the enormous field of the commercial and manufacturing development of the future, where dark-skinned labour will probably one day be employed by white governments and their capitalists on a scale

greater than that of Africa, greater than any known where problems of the same kind present themselves.

Mr. Rice showed the so-called savages to be as interesting, as cultivated, and artistic as are the best of the Indian tribes. They have their pottery, their music, their poetry, and their traditions.

It is right to attach to the admissions of the continuing slaughter of the local natives in the rubber districts of West-Central South America, to which labour is being brought in from afar, the statement of Sir Clements Markham and others that on the Madre de Dios in Peru and Bolivia, the Indians have often driven out the planters over large tracts of territory, Portions of the valley where the river system breaks into the plains are still unknown. In them and in the higher courses within the Andes and west of the Peruvian frontier it is admitted by the official representatives of Peru that "mines which were very productive in olden times when labour was very cheap" are no longer worked even where known to be rich in gold. Intensive development of the tropical regions, and the rapid search for minerals and re-opening of old mines, will go on with increasing speed until within a few years a vast development of population, mostly semi-servile in condition, must have taken place in South America.

Those who know the present conditions of our old African colonies, the Gold Coast, and Sierra Leone, have written of them as "transformed," and Mr. Alldridge, in the most recent book on Sierra Leone, "describes the progress in the last twelve years as incredible." Yet, marvellous as is the development of British West Africa, that of portions of Brazil is still more amazing in its speed.

In the case of Brazil we are able to study the effect of the recent abolition of slavery. There is a great attraction of capital to its fertile tropical soil, and labour is likely to be needed in South America on a larger scale even than in Africa itself. To the temperate districts

it pours in, and all are acquainted with the enormous Italian free immigration to Argentina and German to Southern Brazil. The work done at Panama by free negro labourers from the British West Indian islands is also familiar to readers, and is further noticeable because a good deal of the export of labour to Panama takes place from colonies to which British Indian labour under indenture is going on, under the supervision of the Colonial Governments in question.

The ordinary reason thought good enough by some for justifying the necessity of the indentured labour system, namely that since the abolition of slavery the negro has become disinclined to work, is obviously upset by such facts.

The effect of abolition may, however, best be studied in Brazil. Slavery there continued until after the middle eighties, and Mr. Domville-Fife tells us that the first endeavour to attract European immigrants was made about 1886, in view of the final abolition of slavery in 1888 and the certainty of some temporary embarrassment. The reasons stated by this author for the alarm excited by abolition in Brazil show that the change was more sudden and came at a worse time than can be seriously alleged of the West Indies. The territories affected, too, were far larger, though they did not include the vast tropical forest area of the Amazon valley, even now hardly opened as a planting field.

The Republic of the United States of Brazil has so enormous a territory, of such widely differing descriptions, that the experience of such of its component States as São Paulo throws little light upon the future of the country as a whole. Immigrants are wanted in parts of Brazil for the gradual development of mining resources and for that of cultivation in dry or in fairly watered plains, not unlike those of Australia or Argentina.

The existence of Republican institutions leads Brazil,

like other free States, to wish for white inhabitants, and to devote resources to the encouragement of Europeans even of the less desirable kind rather than of Asiatic population of whom they are suspicious or afraid.

The result is that it is rather companies than governments in Latin America who have attempted to introduce an indentured labour system.

But in Brazil, as in West Africa, the labourer's desire for choice of the character and surroundings of his labour dominate the situation. Mining will not attract where mines are deep and the workmen insufficiently protected by inspection under the law. The efforts which have been made in Brazil to attract the Indian or mixed Indian and negro population to the mines have not, unnaturally, been followed in the State of Minas by the " victory of agriculture " on account of the indolent nature of the coloured inhabitants.

But Brazil is above all the Amazon valley, which, indeed, virtually includes large portions of several other Republics, and the Amazon forest will only be slowly developed by comparison with the more easily handled resources of the agricultural and even of the mining territories.

THE GENERAL CONDITION OF THE COLOURED RACES UNDER THE WHITE MAN'S RULE

HEER VAN KOL

The purpose of this Committee is the protection of the *rights* and the promotion of the interests of *all* subjected races.

Judging the dominant Powers by their *words*, when they defend their Colonial policy, the formation of such a committee might seem superfluous; but seeing their *acts*, the question takes quite another aspect.

Their deeds are characterised by a disdain for the so-called inferior races, against which international rights as well as the precepts of humanity are of no avail. And if civilisation must be proved through actions, the true civilisation, which is more a question of heart and character than of intellect, the superiority of the white man must be strongly doubted.

The inequality of rights by the different races has become a veritable creed; and yet this inequality will gradually diminish; under better circumstances, and in more favourable surroundings, the coloured races will work their way to progress.

But you, who look so presumptuously down on people of another colour of skin—but otherwise people like ourselves, with heart and brains like ours, and able to feel, to suffer, to love, and to hate as we—*what have you done* for their moral and intellectual amelioration? What have you done for the pupils, whose guardianship you took upon you?

Stunted by the indulgence of opium, degenerated by

the abuse of alcohol, they see their rights trampled upon; their lands taken away; sacred vows broken; their instruction inadequate to their needs; their *Press* often not free to speak the truth; and the best places and employment given to strangers. PEACE AND WELFARE were promised; WAR AND MISERY WERE ALL THEY GOT. The overrulers seized the *mines*, and millions flowed away to foreign countries, leaving behind an impoverished people.

The best means of promoting their *welfare*, *i.e.*, the development of a native industry, has never been earnestly taken up, not even in *one* tropical colony. And yet a better *division of work* on the globe, in order to get the *most produce* possible, with the expenditure of the least *labour* would be of general importance to the whole of *mankind*.

The *white race*, relying on cannons and warships, declared itself Sovereign of large parts of the tropical world, and this violent *Imperial expansion* demanded streams of *blood*, caused the most horrid *crimes*, and is a *shame* for our civilisation.

Every Colonial Power, without any exception, has been a cause of *suffering* for the subject races, has sown *misery* for the weak and helpless, and stained its hands with human blood.

We heard yesterday the bitter complaint of the starving millions of Hindustan; the action in flagrant conflict with sacred promises to Egypt; of the intrigues to which Persia may fall a victim; of the shameless cupidity shown in Morocco. And then from Ireland came a cry for liberty, and a voice of strong protestation was raised against the perjury of the Russian Tsar in Finland, as well as against the painful martyrdom of Poland, while Mrs. Dryhurst, at a previous Conference at the Hague moved our hearts in relating what she had seen of the horrors committed in Georgia. The valorous champion for humane treatment of the natives, the late and regretted Mr. Fox Bourne, has depicted the atrocities

committed in obtaining rubber in the Belgian Congo. And it was as if we saw the murdered negroes with mutilated hands, the bloody witnesses of the ferocity of the white man, floating silently on the muddy waves of that great river in an appeal against tyranny to God!

But where to end? A big volume would be needed to describe *all* the injustices and the monstrous deeds of the so-called civilised nations against the coloured races.

The "death-holes" on the Phillippines; the disappearing natives of Australia; the Red Indians destroyed in the United States; the decimation of the Hereres by the Germans; the barbarism of French officers in the Soudan and Madagascar, are as many new evidences.

And—I must acknowledge it with deep shame for my own country—also the massacre in Sumatra of the Atchinese by Holland. Nearly forty years this free and independent people—about 500,000 men, women, and children, in number—has struggled with a heroism, scarcely parallelled in history, against our modern and murderous weapons. Thousands of them have fallen. In the last five years alone of the former Governor-General more than 21,000 human beings have fallen victims of Dutch tyranny. When all the full-grown men had fallen, the children picked up the sword that had fallen from the hands of their dying fathers. A large number of women, of children, have been killed; hostages been taken, prisoners murdered, and constrained guides forced to betray their brethren or die, those who refused to betray being stabbed without mercy. For more than twelve years I have protested in our Parliament (Holland) against this war of conquest, dangerous for a people so small as we are; and for doing so, much injuries I have endured. But I have only done that task, painful for everyone that purely loves his country because I agree with the words of Sir Charles Dilke: "*If we fail to denounce the crime, we become participators in it.*" One of your greatest men, with

Legislative Library Ontario

Gladstone, one of the most noble Englishmen, Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, did not hesitate a moment to signalise "*these methods of barbarism*." At present England has made atonement in the Transvaal, and I hope that after the stringent investigation that took place in 1908 these outrages on humanity in the Dutch Colonies will henceforth belong to the past.

So you will be convinced that crimes have been committed under the white man's rule in nearly every part of the tropical world; and you saw before you a long procession of victims, a large hetacomb of dead bodies. Every Colonial Power without exception has plunged its hands in human blood, and has the mark of Cain branded on its brow.

Therefore it is a heavy and important task which has been treated at this Conference. Then what is the duty of us all? To fight against each prejudice of race, to attain at last an "*international democratisation*," to secure the rights of all subjected nations, to procure their well being or comfort to educate them gradually for autonomy.

No subordination, but elevation; to favour their evolution towards a higher state of civilisation that the white man—once a barbarian himself—has attained. We are witnessing the awakening of the coloured races; they claim in their turn a large and sunny place in the life of humanity.

So, if we feel sympathy for these our brethren; if justice shall be our only guide, we will promote the moral solidarity of all races in the future. This Conference should rouse the international conscience, appeal to the public opinion and the Press—these mighty powers of our days. On the ruins of race prejudices we must erect a new society, in which violence and oppression of the coloured races will make place for the liberty and rights of men of all colours.

LE MOUVEMENT PRO-CONGOLAIS ET ANTI-ESCLAVAGISTE EN SUISSE *

(*Translation given in Appendix*)

MR. RENÉ CLAPARÈDE.

Secretaire Général Honoraire du Comité International du Congo, et Président de la Ligue suisse

Permettez moi de féliciter tout d'abord le comité qui a organisé cette conférence. Il est excellent que ceux qui luttent en divers pays pour une même idée apprennent à se connaître. Je formerai seulement le voeu qu'au prochain congrès le programme soit moins chargé, afin que des discussions puissent avoir lieu. Les libres discussions sont la vie d'un congrès.

La question qui nous préoccupe est double. Il s'agit d'une part de mettre en lumière la situation exacte des noirs : nous avons à étudier la question des terres, celle du travail forcé, etc. D'autre part, nous avons à faire l'éducation de l'opinion publique dans nos pays pour éveiller à ces questions, car elle est encore extraordinairement arriérée. Sans ce rapport, nos pays prétendus civilisés en sont encore à l'état barbare, car c'est être barbare que d'accepter sans mot dire des crimes de lèse-civilisation.

Le mouvement, parti d'Angleterre avec M. Morel, s'est propagé aux États-Unis, en Belgique, en France, en Suisse, et en Allemagne. Un comité international s'est formé pour entretenir entre les associations autonomes des relations d'amitié. Voici en deux mots ce qui a été fait en Suisse au point de vue de l'organisation. Une Ligue Suisse pour la défense des indigènes dans le bassin conventionnel du Congo a été fondé il y a deux ans, avec Siège Social à Genève, mais les trois vice-présidents sont établis dans les cantons de Vaud, de

Neuchâtel et de Bâle; décentralisation utile pour une Société internationale. La Ligue compte environ 450 membres. Seuls les cantons protestants ont rèpondu à l'appel. Les cantons catholiques sont à peine touchés.

Au point de vue moral, de curienses expériences ont été faîtes. Une profonde reconnaissance est due à ceux qui nous ont accordé leur appui, malgré l'opposition incroyable que nous avons rencontrée. On peut ranger les opposants en plusieurs catégories :—

1° Ceux qui nient. Ce sont principalement les anciens agents rentrés en Suisse (car il y a à peu près une centaine d'agents suisses au Congo). Ils n'ont rien vu, rien entendu. Le Congo est une colonie normale. Ils disent cela dans les journaux ou dans des brochures.

Parmi ces négateurs, il faut noter, dans une question connexe—celle de l'Angola—ce journaliste portugais qui a écrit force articles dans les journaux suisses pour nier les faits allégués par Mr. Nevinson* et qui n'a trouvé rien de mieux pour soutenir sa thèse que de prétendre que Mr. Nevinson n'avait jamais existé, qu'il était un mythe!

2° Ceux qui disent : C'est partout la même chose, en Ouganda, en Nigeria, aux Indes, etc. Notez que ce sont des gens cultivés qui disent cela.

3° Ceux qui se méfient parce que l'origine du mouvement est anglais. Ils voient des motifs intéressés dans cette campagne; le désir d'établir la ligne du Cap au Cairo, d'annexer le Congo, etc. Il est êtonnant de constater à quel point les vieux clichés sur " le perfide Albion " sont encore rêpandus dans un pays ami de l'Angleterre.

4° Ceux qui disent : C'est exagéré. Ils ne se doutent pas que, loin d'exagérer, tout ce que nous disons est au dessous de la vérité. La question des femmes, par exemple, est un chapitre qui n'a jamais été traité. Il faudrait qu'une nouvelle Joséphine Butler se levât et

* In "Modern Slavery" and in various letters and articles in the London Press and in *The Manchester Guardian*.

osât dire tout haut la façon dont sont traités les femmes noires.

5° Le silence voulu. Par exemple, dans la question de San-Thomé, malgré tous les articles écrits ou les communications faites aux Ligues d'achteurs, les chocalatiers suisses n'ont pas donné signe de vie.

6° Ceux qui excusent le système par motif philanthropique, en disant : Les nègres sont plus heureux ainsi qu'avant, où régnaient la traité arabe, les ordalies, les sacrifices vivants. A San-Thomé, en particulier, les négres, a écrit un des premiers journaux de la Suisse, sont plus heureux que dans l'hinterland de l'Angola.

7° L'attitude de la presse. En Suisse, seul, un journal hebdomdaire, le *Signal de Genève*, lutte avec persévérance depuis plus de quatre ans. De rares journaux publient loyalement les articles ou appels qui leur sont envoyés, les autres ne les insèrent pas. Un journal a même refusé une lettre en donnant comme motif que le Congo était une question trop lointaine. D'autres refusent de traiter ce qui concern l'Angola et San-Thomé par peur de polémiques avec les Portugais défenseurs du système établis en France ou en Suisse.

L'habilité de nos adversaires en ce qui concerne la presse est très grande : ils ont su notamment gagner les correspondants bruxellois de la plupart des grands journaux. C'est là un point très délicat, mais notre fédération peut être utile comme centre de renseignements sur les dits correspondants qu'il faut absolument démasquer.

8° Il faut noter enfin l'indifférence du public, pire que toutes les attaques ou que toutes les machinations hostiles. La plus scandaleuse est celle du public chrétien, qui devrait être en tête et qui souvent n'arrive timidement qu'après le public libre-penseur.

Cette hostilité et cette indifférence nous amènent à la conclusion. La continuation de la lutte s'impose, sous

* Mrs. Georgina King Lewis has touched this point in her booklet, "Slavery in the Twentieth Century" (Hoadley Bros).—Ed.

forme d'un travail parallèle intense menè par nos ligues de combat, d'une part pour obtenir perpétuellement des renseignements de date fraiche sur le Congo ou l'Angola, de l'autre pour éduquer l'opinion publique. Notons en terninant des signes fâcheux et des signes réjouissants. Les premiers sont la difficulté de la Ligue belge de trouver un secrétaire, ce qui en fait une ligue mort-née; et une certaine paralysie que l'on constate au sein de la *Congo Reform Association* Américaine. Les signes réjouissants sont les suivants: 162 députés au Parlement anglais ont adressé une lettre à M. Asquith pour protester contre la spoliation des terres et les scandaleux délais que consacrent les prétendues "reformes" de M. Renkin. Ensuite la fondation de la Ligue allemande du Congo cette année même. Enfin la Conférence actuelle de Londres, qui co-ordonne nos efforts.

L'Angleterre a allumé un feu qui ne doit point s'éteindre. Persévérons dans notre lutte contre la renaissance hypocrite de l'esclavage, et la victoire, qui n'est accordée qu'à la persévérance, couronnera nos efforts.

Mr. Travers Buxton, the Secretary of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, moved the following resolution:—

> "That in territories in which control is exercised by dominant powers over native races, the utmost care should be taken not only to prohibit slave-trading and slavery, but that no system of forced, indentured, or contract labour should be permitted whereby the labour of the natives is exploited for the economic advantage of the other races; further, that no system of administration should be allowed whereby the natives are forcibly or fraudulently deprived of their rights to their land and its produce."

Mr. Buxton then pronounced the following protest against slavery and forced labour.

It is an entire mistake to suppose that slavery is a thing of the past. Slave raiding and dealings in slaves still go on in different parts of Africa; but the most subtle forms of slavery are those which go on under disguises, such as that of indentured and contract labour, for which all sorts of more or less plausible excuses are made.

The greatest difficulty of to-day, in dealing with native races, arises from the policy of commercially exploiting them for private gain. The systems of slavery of which we heard so much in the Congo and Portuguese West Africa are but extreme examples of this exploitation policy, and, as the demand for black labour grows greater and the areas available for that labour become more limited, the danger is increased. The three most flagrant modern instances of this policy are now carried on in Portuguese West Africa, Tripoli, and Peru.

According to the latest figures, the number of labourers who are taken from the interior of Africa to the cocoa plantations of San Thomé and Principe reach nearly 6,000 a year, and this importation involves an immense amount of suffering and waste of human life in bringing down the labourers from their homes to the coast. Of all those thus exploited, a mere handful were reported, quite lately, to have been repatriated, and it is more than doubtful whether any have ever actually reached their homes. The Portuguese Government now promises reforms, but the system is incapable of reform.

Slaves are brought into Tripoli from the French and Anglo-Egyptian spheres of territory in the central Soudan. The French and Italian Anti-Slavery Societies have long protested against this traffic, and the French Government has already taken a step towards dealing with the question through their consuls in Tripoli.

Appalling reports of outrages upon natives have been recently received from Peru, where, in a remote territory, the native Indians employed in the collection of

rubber by a commercial Company are, according to information supplied by eye-witnesses, subjected to gross outrage, torture, and murder. The system is similar to that of the Congo, from which no worse cases had been brought to light than some of those which are now reported from the Putumayo Valley, duly supported by a great amount of evidence. These allegations are now occupying the serious attention of our Foreign Office.

The whole question of modern slavery and forced labour is every day assuming greater proportions, and it is not one which the English nation, with its traditions, can afford to ignore.

Mr. E. B. Morel, the well-known leader of the Congo Reform movement, and the Rev. J. H. Harris supported the resolution, which was passed unanimously.

Mr. Keir Hardie, who was present during part of the proceedings, also spoke on the general question, and made an emphatic protest against all attempts to build up civilisation and progress on the rotten foundations of injustice and cruelty.

FIFTH SESSION

Proposed Remedies for Existing Grievances

The Fifth Session of the Conference, held on the evening of Thursday, June 30th, 1910, at Caxton Hall, Westminster, S.W., had as its subject: "Proposed Remedies for Existing Grievances." Mr. J. A. Hobson presided, and there was a large attendance of delegates.

The Chairman, Mr. J. A. Hobson, who was received with prolonged applause, in opening the proceedings, said:—

Ladies and gentlemen, those of you who have attended the meetings of this Congress have heard from competent authorities a recital of the difficulties and the wrongs connected with the relations between dominant nations and certain subject nationalities and races. To-night we have before us an uncommonly difficult task—to propose to ourselves,—and I may say to the world, the remedies which appear to us to be appropriate to meet those difficulties. Now if I may be allowed to re-state in brief the problem as it appears to me it amounts to this. Every problem of conduct, whether on the individual or national scale, if it is a difficult problem, implies a certain contradiction between professions and practices, that is to say, an inconsistency between what we think we mean and say and what we really mean and actually do. Now this problem in a sense is a modern problem. It did not arise in the Imperialism of the ancient world in any clear shape whatever. The old Imperialistic nations knew very well what they were doing, and they made no bones about it. If they went out to loot any territory they said so, and their armies

executed the behests of those who planned this policy. They went for gold or they went for slaves or for trade or for glory or for extension of territory, and they knew what they were doing and meant to do it.

Now, in comparatively modern times a change took place in the attitude of the dominant nations towards these acts of aggression. They came to consider that it was more respectable to put a certain gloss upon their motives. This was not an invention of the present age. You find it in the Spanish Imperialism of centuries ago, when that most Christian nation set out to Christianise the lower nations, taking from them all the treasures they might happen to possess. But we get the full-blown inconsistency in recent times. Imperialistic nations now—nations who wish to fasten dominion upon weaker people, or to hold down territories which contain upon them true nationalities unable to sustain themselves against the forces of dominant power—such people allege—and, mind you, allege with what appears to them very often to be truth—other motives than those which are actually driving them along their line of conduct. They say, and their spokesmen often think, that what they are really concerned with primarily, if not entirely, is the good order of civilisation. They find certain peoples in a disturbed condition upon their frontiers, they find certain rulers of nefarious character and of destructive habits, they find a Prempeh, a Theebaw, a Mahdi, or a Mullah, whom they term mad, they find, or try to find, some evil person of this character who is representative of a degraded and injurious civilisation upon their frontiers, and they go into the country with force in order that they may restore good order for the benefit of the people of that country and of the civilised world.

Sometimes conjoined with or substituted for this motive is another. The resources of certain parts of the world are developing; it is desirable from the standpoint of the interests of the wealth of the world that whatever

natural resources there may be in any part of the world, although these resources may be under the nominal dominion of another people, it is desirable that they should be developed, and if the people are so backward and so ignorant or so obstinate that they refuse to develop them, then it is the business, even the duty, of the nearest powerful neighbour to step in and undertake to teach them how to do the duty they neglected. Along with that there is another plea, doubtless urged with perfect genuineness by most of those who use it: a desire to spread the general moral good of civilisation among the backward people of the earth—that the nation which is advanced in civilisation shall reach out a helping hand to elevate the lower peoples and to teach them western science, western morals, and western manners, and lead them along the path to true self-government. These are the professions; and I want to say this to you, that I think they are professions genuinely held by many people who maintain them. I shall touch upon that position directly. No one who reads the newspapers can doubt that statesmen in this country, as in France, in Germany, or in America, do profess what I have stated, that they are actuated first of all by the good of the subject races, and secondly of the civilised world, and thirdly, if at all, and quite incidentally, by some advantage which may come to themselves. Last night Colonel Seely, in an interesting speech, covered the whole of our colonial policy and explicitly set forth this doctrine in discussing the development of the resources of Eastern Africa. He said our duty was not to develop these natural resources as rapidly as they can be developed; our first duty, he said, was to develop them soundly and in the interest first of all of the aboriginal population. There we have the profession in its plainest—I might almost say its crudest—form. I will ask you to contrast that profession with the actual history of our relations with the people who have these resources, and to consider whether

in point of fact we, or other nations who undertake this work, have or have not been in the habit of developing those countries for the interest of the aborigines in the first place.

Now, you see, you have these professions graded in three forms. The widest profession purports that the control of the subject races is undertaken on behalf of the good of the civilised world; secondly, that it is undertaken on behalf of the good of the subject people; and, thirdly, that some incidental gain and advantage may come to the people who undertake this pious duty. Now I need not argue to you what the practice is; I have stated the theory or the professions; these three motives may all be present in the actual relations of a dominant over a subject race; but they are present in a different order and in a different proportion from that which is contained in the professions—the third of these motives is substituted for the first and the second, and certainly takes a prior importance in the play of history. So far as we are able faithfully to interpret the course of Imperialism, in modern times we can find several not wholly distinct, but still fairly separate, motives at work. The first is that which was a dominant motive in all times when people sought empire, the desire to exploit in some shape or other the backward or inferior race. That exploitation takes a different shape in modern times. We do not find it good for ourselves or for anybody crudely to draw masses of wealth in the shape of taxation from that subject race. We find it better generally to put ourselves upon a basis of sound trading policy with these people, and to take our gains from the forms of international exchange. Still more important, we plant upon these nations and their territories the spare capital which more and more seeks investment out of our own country; and, from my standpoint, this is the most powerful single motive making for the modern policy of Imperialism—the desire to extend the effective and profitable area of investment by getting hold of and

developing the territories which belong to other people, and using the labour power of those lower people to assist us in grinding out dividends and profits for those investments. Along with that we find the more subtle desire of politicians and important people in general for territorial and political aggrandisement for themselves, for their class, and for their own native country. This is the way in which so-called patriotism comes in as a motive to Imperial aggression. There is a third motive, however, which I would distinguish, and that is the desire, the increasing desire in modern times, to find effective, lucrative, and interesting careers for the men who want to go out of their own country, for the benefit of their country, or for the benefit of themselves, and carve out careers in distant countries. This, I say, is not entirely a new motive. James Mill, I think, it was who described the British colonial system of his time as "a gigantic system of out-relief for the sons of the wealthy classes."

Thus very briefly and imperfectly I have tried to put before you the main contrast between the professions and the practices which are involved in the government of subject peoples, but you will remember that it is our object this evening to discuss remedies. Now the only remedy that can be considered effective for dealing with this situation is a very difficult remedy; it is that of making our practice square with our professions. But it is not an entirely hopeless remedy. If it is a hopeless remedy, then it is idle for us to sit in this hall and discuss these questions. If the professions which are soberly, solemnly, made by important persons in the control of Government in the various civilised nations, if these professions really mean nothing, if they are merely hypocritical cloaks, then we have no moral leverage whatever for anything that can be called a reform movement. Now I am in the position of holding that these professions are not the outcome of deliberate hypocrisy—of hypocrisy combined with deliberate

brutality. I believe we have in this country—I do not know that we have a monopoly of this gift—we have a certain genius of self-deception. I believe, to take a recent example, that when Sir Edward Grey the other day, in dealing with the case of Egypt, said that we were in Egypt for two objects—for the good of Egypt and for the advantage of the world; and when he omitted to say that any part of the motive for being there was a desire to assist ourselves financially, or to assist ourselves commercially—when he said that, I believe he meant it, and simply forgot what was really the dominant historic motive in the beginning of the process which he was engaged in defending.

The paradox, as it seems to me, which Imperialism presents in such countries as India and Egypt in particular, is this. A civilised nation whose civilisation, if it is based on anything, is based on a higher moral status, going in to civilise these backward—or, as they seem to most English people, even lower—nations, can only execute this duty by using those superior moral gifts it claims. Now the two peculiar gifts of which we claim not precisely a monopoly, but an advantage in this country, are first our faculty of telling the truth and keeping our word; secondly, our superior faculty for doing common justice. Now these are the two gifts which we must use to civilise and elevate, and teach the arts of self-government to these other peoples. When we go there what do we do? Well, I am not going to give you a recital of the actions which have been put before you by speakers on these subjects, but it is quite plain that we have distinguished ourselves in quite dramatic instances by an absolute refusal to keep our pledged word, and by a contravention of what in this country among all classes would be regarded as the simplest elements of justice. We have used the reverse of these moral powers required to do the very work which we profess, the work of moral civilisation; and the result of this contradiction between our professions and

our practice is a certain recoil upon our own character. That is a point on which I would desire to say a word, because it is something not understood. It is sometimes confused with the wrongs done to the subject peoples, the retardations of their natural progress in the art of government. That is a grievous wrong, but quite as injurious is the moral recoil upon the character of the people who attempt this process. Just as the slave-owner is injured by the process of slavery, so the Imperialistic nation is injured by the process of Imperialism. It corrupts his motives and it corrupts his intelligence; it damages even his sense of language. What sort of terms are those which are invoked in the process of Imperialism? We are led along by terminology relating to scientific frontiers, hinterlands, spheres of interest, spheres of influence, and all the sliding scale of veiled suzerainty and protectorates, and we know not what. No one can define with any degree of accuracy and truth any one of these terms, and their indefiniteness is essentially part of their spurious utility. It is by this very slipperiness of phraseology that we proceed to deceive ourselves in regard to the motives which actuate us. I might take other terms. I will not ask you to consider such a term as indenture—a term discussed here before you last night—or such a term as sedition or agitation as they are employed in regard to the legitimate criticism which members of the subject races may venture to make upon the Government of the dominant races. All these shifty sets of sliding phrases are simply so much testimony to the moral and intellectual degeneration produced by the practice of attempting to hold down another people. Abraham Lincoln, as you know, said that no man is good enough to govern another without the other's consent. It is equally true of a nation, that no nation is good enough to govern another nation without that nation's consent. Well, you will say I have not got to the remedies yet. Now, on this question of remedies there is a certain misconception, I

think. There are some people to whom remedy is a very simple thing. They say there is nothing more to be said; do not go into this business, or if you are in it get out of it. Well, I quite agree. I have nothing to say against this principle, except that it does not go quite far enough. It does not explain the process by which the principle may be applied. It is not possible for us or any other gathering of people who believe that we understand our laws and institutions to persuade the government of any dominant people to treat the matter in this way and simply to retire, leaving to the subject race the solution of all the special problems which their presence and their dominance have produced. This cannot be done, nor if it could be done, in my judgment, is it desirable. And here I may be sinning against the position of certain pure Nationalists among you. I am not a pure Nationalist in the sense of holding that the people who happen to be in possession of a particular territory at a particular time are to have for all time hereafter the sole control of that territory. If Nationalism means that, then I am not a complete Nationalist. I do not believe, for instance, that the fact that there were a number of wandering tribes in North America should have altogether precluded the colonisation of that country by white people. I do not believe that, nor do I believe that in South Africa the presence of wandering tribes of Kaffirs means that white people should be kept out entirely and of necessity from that country for ever and leave it to those wandering tribes of Kaffirs, men who had no original claim in their favour, because you have got behind them the Hottentots and Bushmen, and you would have had to decide a very difficult and tangled problem of the rights of nationality if you had to discriminate between the rival claims of those various peoples. That is sufficient to show you that there are some difficulties in the simple answer which some of us would like to make to the problem of Imperialism. It is sometimes necessary

and even desirable that people should force their way upon territory which is half occupied by other people. They have indeed no right to say that they are sanctioned by any desire of civilisation or are acting for the benefit of those other people; but they are justified if their need is great, they are justified in doing what every man does in an emergency to satisfy his need as a member of the society in which he lives. A nation has the same rights in extreme cases to deal with emergencies which an individual would have. He cannot wait for the sanction of the world or of a tribe which may not, or in the case of nations, does not exist, before he takes action, action sometimes necessary in his own self-preservation.

There are many cases of that kind in the course of history which will cut across this doctrine of the absolute ownership of a particular piece of land by the nation or race which happens at the time to be upon it. But what is important is that we should realise the conditions which it is desirable for us to try to bring about in order to secure subject peoples against abuse of this rare right which I have tried to designate. It is necessary that we should work towards the establishment of something which is no less than a real International Government, for nothing less than that can really solve the problem of empire. We must have a tribunal; we must have behind that tribunal an organised sense of the nations if we are to compass the remedies which are desirable —if we are in the first place to prevent the wanton encroachment of the stronger nation upon the sound, perhaps sounder, nationalities that lie around it, and in the second place to authorise an intervention for the sake of the good order of the country or for the legitimate purpose of offering assistance to a backward people. For it ought to be possible that a forward nation in the arts of civilisation should be able to assist, not for its own benefit, but for the benefit of its weaker brethren, the lower nation. I do not desire to put forward a doctrine or a remedy which shall preclude a nation

following the true lines of advance in the evolution of the society of nations. We therefore ought to have this right; but it should be under the supervision of a tribunal which represents the good or the supposed good of the civilised world, and it should insist that where this work is undertaken the Power which undertakes to restore order or to educate shall retire as soon as that work is done and shall leave the Nationality in possession of the full liberty of self-development on its own behalf.

Those are the conditions towards which we should labour in order to make it possible to solve these questions—to help to erect, in other words, the international society in order to secure the rights of effective protest against the invasion of the weaker by the stronger Nationality. For it is not simply sufficient to persuade a dominant people that they shall do their duty by a weaker nation; you must organise the society of nations around it. That organisation must be backed, if necessary, by force. I do not hesitate to say by physical force as well as moral force, because it will be a long time before we can look forward to a condition of moral authority either in the limits of a single nation or in the wider limits of the world and dispense with that use of force which sometimes is essential for the furtherance of moral purpose. This is the problem as it presents itself to me, and I will not attempt to occupy any further time, but I will call upon those who are to discuss the question of remedies.

We have with us to-night a gentleman who knows "what is wrong with the world and how to remedy it." I will ask him to tell us.

Mr. G. K. Chesterton.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen,—Before I go any further may I say that the title to which you, sir, have just alluded was invented by my publisher. It was forced upon me against my will. I wanted to have a very mild title—so mild that I will not even mention it in so

demagogic a society as this. It was invented by my publisher, and because I did not take the trouble to alter it, it got printed on the outside of the book along with that horrible picture of me. I merely say that to begin with, because I do implore you, not for myself but in the interests of all the other charlatans and quacks and boomsters of the modern world—in the interests of Mr. Bernard Shaw and Mr. Hall Caine and Marie Corelli and everybody—I do implore you to believe that half of that push is made up by your publisher for you. Certainly all that was for me. I should no more have dreamed of writing a book called " What is wrong with the World" than of flying. In my opinion what is wrong with the world is the devil, and he is not the subject I take in that particular work.

Well, if you will excuse this momentary spasm of egotism, in response to the taunt of the chairman, I will proceed to apologise to that same chairman to show that there is no ill-feeling for having come on to this platform in the middle of his speech. I am very sorry indeed that I did not hear the earlier part of it, but I have discovered by long experience that I belong to the backward races of the world in most of these respects, and that leads me to one of the very few things that I have to say. Because my difficulty about all these questions is not at all a doubt that compromise should be made here or there. I do not much mind that there will be always a certain amount of corruption and vulgarity in all politicians, because they are politicians. But what is really a matter of doubt to me is, which are the " backward races "? You see, I do not know anything about any of the other races—I have never lived in China or Africa, or in any of those nasty places, or what appear to me to be nasty places, and therefore I do not know whether they are backward or forward. And even if I did know I should still ask what these two words mean. But I do know that in my own country and in most European countries with which I am acquainted, as far

as I can see, all the backward people are the nicest people. I do know that all the people everywhere who upon the whole tend to carry on their old traditions and habits of their families and so on, are, nine times out of ten, the people to whom you can safely lend a £5 note or offer to fight with some possibility of their not running away. Therefore I have a very strong suspicion, a strong fundamental suspicion, that what we call the backward peoples of the world are the peoples who are keeping the secrets of humanity.

Now what you are actually to do with them is a very different matter, and I understand I am one of the various people who are stood in a row on this platform as remedies for the situation. I will proceed to offer myself as a remedy. And what my very small intelligence, which is rather that of an ordinary English yokel slightly affected by London journalism, says is this—there are a lot of people on this planet that are very different from me and from most people on this platform, and from—shall we say?—a majority of the people in this hall. As to what we are to do with them, it appears to me to divide itself quite clearly and sharply into two policies. One policy is to leave them entirely alone—that is to say, they are men like ourselves, they also have come from mothers, they always look forward to death, they have all the fundamental conceptions like ourselves, let them muddle out, let them build up some sort of society if they can. I have no doubt they can in some kind of way, though I should not like it myself. In other words, let us preserve the old Little England idea of leaving people alone, and if they do happen to have the habit of torturing people or holding slaves or of doing anything else that happens to be against our view, let us put it down to the general account of the evil of the world and say it is not our business. That seems to be a perfectly sensible and intelligent position, and upon the whole I am in favour of it.

There is another possible policy to my mind, and that is this: Let us say by an accident, or whatever it is —the will of God or something—a portion of the human race has, as a matter of fact, advanced a great deal in what is rightly called political science. As it happens the white people have developed a lot of application of machinery, which you may like or dislike, which makes them unique among the peoples of the earth. Very well, if that is the doctrine, it is possible to argue from it that we ought to extend civilisation to all the peoples of the world. I do not agree with it, but I mean that it is a tenable position. But if that is the position there is not the slightest doubt in the world to my mind that there is one thing and one thing only that we have any right whatever to extend to the peoples of the world, and that is democracy.

If we as white people have anything at all to do in the world it is that, and it is nothing else. If we have anything that we can give to the other peoples it is this sense of nationality and citizenship. Now I am perfectly prepared as regards the question of remedy to leave that small bone to you as a dilemma. But either way, Mr. Roosevelt is wrong. Either way, the ordinary modern theory of Imperialism is wrong. If we are, as I say, if we are simply one of the peoples of the earth like any other, it is undoubtedly better for general human morality that we should leave other people alone. If, on the other hand, we had to preach anything that is of our souls and of ourselves, if we have to give of our best to the rest of the world, then I think that what we have to give is votes—citizenship.

Now the other thing I should like to mention in this connection is one word about nationality. It appears to me that it is possible to get into some confusion upon that point. I do not affirm anything about races I do not understand. I do not affirm anything of the races of Asia, the aboriginal races of Asia or of Africa, but I do say there does exist a definite thing called a nation,

which is a thing of the mind. You can no more define it than you can define a church or you can define a love affair or you can define a friendship, but you will usually know when it exists, as you do in the case of a love affair, you know it chiefly by its being a nuisance.

But there does arise at certain definite periods of human history a coherence of human beings who sign themselves all with one sign, who say, "We are one, we will march under this flag, we want this thing." They have become a corporate body in the strongest language of religion, they have become a sacrament, and if you interfere with them you will recollect it.

It is a characteristic of all enthusiasts that they forget to move. The resolution which I propose to move, and which may or may not be in accordance with the remarks I have just uttered, is the following: "That the preservation and revival of national liberties and characteristics make for the enrichment of civilisation"—that is quite true—"that the claim of any subject people of distinct nationality to the management of its own affairs should be recognised by the dominant power"—if there ought to be any—"and an International Tribunal should be established to take cognisance of violation of all treaties, conventions, and agreements, between great Powers and small or subject nationalities." That is the motion.

Mr. S. H. Swinny.

I have been asked by the Committee that has organised this Conference to second the resolution which Mr. Chesterton has moved, and in doing so I shall say little about the question of the Tribunal, because that has already been dealt with by the Chairman. I shall deal principally with the earlier words of the resolution, "That the preservation and revival of national liberty and characteristics make for the enrichment of civilisation, that the claim of any subject people of distinct nationality to the management of its own affairs should be recognised by the dominant power."

Now in speaking of the advantages and the strength of nationality, I do not mean in any way to imply that there is not a general bond uniting the whole human race. There was a time when it was considered that there was something narrow in patriotism, and that an international feeling was alone to be cultivated. But I think we have now reached a healthier feeling, and we see that what is wanted is not to build up mankind like some low animal organism of cells, each like the other and each performing the same functions, but that we should strive for a higher form of organisation in which various nations should each bring their special gifts to the common stock and the common work, and in which mankind should be the richer by the various traditions and various civilisations which should make up the whole.

Now when I speak of a nation I quite agree with Mr. Chesterton that it is something that cannot be defined, but there are certain characteristics by which we may know it, one of these being that it has some definite territory to which it can look as the home of its nationality and to which even its exiles can look when they are far away from it; and secondly, that there should be a national tradition made up of the struggles and the efforts, the victories and the sufferings that have marked its career, and which form a common heritage and common memories to the whole body of its people. That, in fact, there should be a development of national consciousness which can survive the assaults of even the most powerful enemies.

When I listened to the eloquent speech of my fellow-countryman, Mr. Gavan Duffy, yesterday, while I quite agree with him that there had been a time, and, indeed many times, in the history of Ireland when many valuable characteristics of the nation—which, I hope, it is destined to hand down as part of its contribution to the universal civilisation of humanity—were in danger of being lost by the overwhelming influence of its more

powerful neighbour, I still remembered how strong was the national consciousness of that country, and believed that it would certainly triumph over all efforts to undermine or destroy it, and that the only possible destruction that could fall upon it would be, that the long-continued waste of the nation, the loss of millions after millions of its population, should go on till no Irish remained in Ireland. As long as any remained there, I was confident that the national character of Ireland must necessarily remain too.

And if I turn to another great country far away, which I am glad to see so well represented in our Conference, if I turn to India I cannot help thinking that the greatest advantage which our connection with India has given to that country is one of which the apologists for British rule never speak. It is not the Pax-Britannica, for that only seems brilliant when it is compared, not with the whole history of India, but with the period of confusion that followed the decay of the Mogul Empire. It is not British justice, although that had a great reputation —a reputation that has been blemished by some of those things which we have lately seen, by deportation without trial, by the revival of the worst practice of the Spanish Inquisition, the refusal to inform the accused either of the crime of which he is accused or of the name of his accuser. When I remember this I am inclined to think that the greatest thing the British Government has done for India has been to make active what before was latent and to awaken in India the national consciousness. So that while there had been an abiding unity underlying all the seeming diversity in the life of India for centuries and centuries, we now see springing up that national consciousness which shall unite the people of India from one end to the other, which has already united the Mahratta and the Bengalee, and which I am sure will in the end unite the Moslem and the Hindoo.

An eminent statesman who has passed away from us,

but I venture to think will be remembered when those of more superficial brilliance have long been forgotten—I mean Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman—in one of his wisest moments said that self-government was better than good government. There can be no better or more permanent basis for good government than to support it and unite it with the sense of nationality and of true patriotism. Now, in this resolution which is put before us, we not only say that it is desirable that national characteristics should be maintained, but we also declare in favour of self-government. And before I sit down I would like to associate myself with a remark of the chairman, that it is not the nation that is dominated but also the nation that is dominating that suffers, and perhaps the latter suffers more, from Imperial expansion.

An eminent foreigner who has been so continually alluded to in this meeting—I am almost ashamed to allude to him again—has laid down a canon of self-government which, if it be true, would exclude his own nation from the ranks of the self-governed. And in saying this, in refusing to accept the existence of a single assassination or even an assassination of three Presidents as a reason for taking away self-government, do not let it be supposed that I consider assassination as a legitimate measure of political warfare. Those of us who protest, and continually protest, against deportation without trial, how much more shall we protest against killing without trial? And those of us who look forward to a time when the conscience of nations shall rule, how can we approve of the action of a self-appointed individual who chooses to be at once prosecutor, judge, and executioner, and exercises a justice to which he has never been deputed?

But supposing for a moment we take it that President Roosevelt's countrymen will agree with this view, and will allow him to surrender their liberties to some nation—if a nation there be which has never been guilty of assassination—I am afraid that our country is

the one on which he intends to place the burden of the real United States, since it is to us he made this confidence. And I am sure when we are suppressing freedom of public meeting in Boston and imprisoning the editors of papers in New York and deporting without trial the citizens of Philadelphia and Chicago, even our Imperialists will be of opinion that we have almost enough Imperialism for our capacities. Whether we have much or little, it is certain to me that on that altar of Imperialism we are sacrificing not only the liberty of others but the liberty and the honour of ourselves.

Dr. Rutherford: I understand that there are a great number of speakers to follow me, and I have been specially requested to speak briefly, so that I think I had better at once make a confession of faith to you: I believe there is only one remedy for those wrongs of mankind with which we are specially dealing to-night, and that is to ask the people who are affected how they want their wrongs righted and to follow their advice. The best thing that we can do is to go to India and ask her representatives, her intellectuals, what they want, and give it to them. If they want to govern their country, surely that is a legitimate and proper aspiration. Let them govern it—they are quite capable of governing it. Surely they can govern it a thousand times better than we can. They would not make the hideous mistakes that we have made in the past, and they would be able to do more justly, wisely, rightly by their own people.

Well, I think that is the simplest plan and the simplest solution of all the problems that we have been discussing—to ask the several nationalities how they want to be governed and at once to follow their advice. Now I am a great believer in Parliamentary government. I think it is the wisest and best form of government that has yet been introduced into this world.

I do not know why some people should laugh—perhaps they are ladies and have not got representation, but I am prepared to give them representation. I feel that the history of the world is with us, and that up to the present time Parliamentary government has proved to be the best form of government, and therefore I advocated Parliamentary government in the House of Commons for India and Egypt, and I still adhere to that. And when we are told by Mr. Balfour that the Orientals are not ready for self-government, that they are not ready for Parliamentary government, that they are not adapted to free institutions like ourselves and like some European Powers, then I have to ask him what about Japan. Is not Japan governed by Parliamentary government, and is it not since she got her Parliamentary Government that she has had her rapid rise in the world? I do not say that the two are intimately associated, but very probably there is a very considerable connection.

Then what about Persia? Persia has chosen Parliamentary government as the best system, and she has succeeded in getting rid of her late despot the Shah. But Persia is in great trouble at the present moment, and for that reason I want to put in a word for Persia. May I ask you to realise what we were told yesterday, and what we realised in the House of Commons some months, nay, some years ago, that Persia was in peril of her life and that the Anglo-Russian Convention has given us the right and the position to say to Russia, "You shall not interfere in the government of Persia!" To all intents and purposes we guaranteed the independence of Persia, and Sir Edward Grey has no right as a Liberal Minister in this country to go back upon it; it is his duty to carry out the behests and the demands of the people of this country, and we demand that Persia shall have her own government.

I am not going to deal with Finland: that has been so well and properly dealt with by other people. But

surely, again by the entente we have with Russia, we should put in our spoke there for the advantage, the safety, and the emancipation of the Finns.

And what about Turkey? Turkey has developed her self-governing institutions rapidly. Some people think too rapidly, but we trust that they will go well, and we believe they will go well. Now already we have got some sort of Parliamentary government in Egypt, and in India we have got Legislative Councils and both local and Imperial forms of organisation. All that we believers in self-government ask is, "Convert those shams into realities." They are nothing but shams at the present moment, in spite of Lord Morley's reforms. They are absolutely in the hands of the officials, they are purely overruled by Europeans. What we ask is that the Indians shall govern and control in these legislative councils. They are miniature Parliaments, but at present sham Parliaments; let us make them real Parliaments if the Indians want them. It is the same in Egypt. There again they have got the semblance of Parliamentary institutions, but there again the Egyptians are treated like pawns and cyphers. We say treat them like men, let them control their own country; they are perfectly capable of controlling their own country. They have got rid of their native despotism, and now they want to get rid of their alien despotism. Is not that right and proper and patriotic and praiseworthy? And it is for us to support these men in their contention, to back them up for all we are worth.

May I say just one word on the sad side of Nationalism? There is a sad side, I suppose, to every great and noble and magnificent movement. And the sad side of Nationalism, both in India and Egypt and other parts of the world, is assassination. I was glad that Mr. Swinny denounced assassination; I denounce it too; I say human life is sacred. But if the individual life is sacred, is not national life ten thousand times

more sacred? And who is responsible for the destruction of national life in Egypt? Great Britain. Who was responsible for the destruction of national life, racial life, in India? Great Britain. And who was responsible for the destruction of national life in South Africa? In this respect we are the greatest criminals that the world has ever seen. I mean what I say, and what I am saying is supported by history. You cannot deny it; we can touch it up and veneer it as much as we like, but we know this Imperialism is a foul and a brutal and a criminal thing. Yet we have partly solved the problem in South Africa by giving them Parliamentary institutions—that is the greatest thing that has been done in modern times by this country. Our friend Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, whose memory we all revere, initiated that movement, and what we now want to see is an extension of this principle to every part of the British Empire, for the British Empire will never be sound, never be true, never be right in the world until every portion of it governs itself.

Mr. B. Chandra Pal.

I confess that I feel in a queer position in the midst of this glaring civilisation, because I am not civilised, and I am not ashamed to say so. When civilisation enters the confessional and admits to the world at large its multitudinous sins, committed and omitted, I begin to get a little suspicious. Of course, I am not suspicious of the generous sentiments which have been uttered on that platform, because I know they are words of the heart and not of the mouth, and I appreciate the generous sympathy expressed by members of the dominant race in the capital of the British Empire. Lord Morley, speaking of Ireland, once said: "Ireland wants a policy, and we give her sympathy." Now I do not want a policy for India from the English. If they think any true Indian Nationalist would stand with hat in hand before them for the rights he claimed to be his

own, if they think that the Indian Nationalists pleaded with them to make a present of self-government to India or any other country, they do not understand the meaning and the spirit of Indian Nationalism.

When for a short time I was the honoured guest of the Government of India, my host, a member of the Indian Medical Service, the present superintendent of Buxar, came to me and said: "What do you want? Do you want the British to get out of the country?" To that I replied: "The question is meaningless." He said: "How will you people be able to govern yourselves?" I replied to that: "Are you going to quit the country now? The question absolutely has no practical value to anyone. You are there, and you propose to be there as long as we do not make it impossible for you to continue there. And from the time we make it impossible for you to be there we shall be very educated, qualified, strong to govern and protect ourselves."

A good deal has been said about Parliamentary government, but speaking with the humility which befits a barbarian, and with experience of the hustings, where every man spoke against every other man, where men took one another's characters away, where politicians lived, as the poet said, in "a hubbub of lies," I am not sure whether Parliamentary government as developed in civilised countries is an ideal order of government. We do not concede the right to a civilised nation to impose its forms on us. The root of the evil of the problem lies in the fact that the civilised nation is judging the Indian nation, not by its own legitimate standard, not even by the universal standard of humanity, but by the legal standards of white humanity.

The question has been asked, What is the best form of government? The best form of government is that which a nation, by following its own historic evolution, developed for itself. The British have developed a particular form of government, but they must not impose

that form on India. Great Britain had imposed many things on India without perhaps meaning evil; I do not say that Great Britain is evil-minded; I admit her people are generous, but they are more conceited than they are generous. India would have been thankful for the generosity if they had spared a little of their side. The English do not know anything of India, they do not care to know anything of India, they do not know the civilisation of India, and do not care to know the civilisation of India, and they do not know of the civic life which has grown up in India. They want India as suppliant to make a few genuflections to emperors for a few elementary rights of trade.

We are, of course, thankful to Providence for a good many things the British had done there. It is necessary to show my loyalty and to preserve my skin that I should say a good word in favour of the Government of India, because as piety and praise must precede prayer, so in politics the acknowledgment of the great good that Governments have done must precede any protest against the evil that they might have committed. I therefore acknowledge the good that the Government has done. Mr. Mackarness has said that the great sin was in attempting the police torture in India, but he did not mention the great efforts which had been made by Lord Morley to reform the police administration in that country. I will take warning from Mr. Montagu's castigation of Mr. Mackarness, and admit that he did great things. The British have worked out a settled Government in India out of anarchy which they had themselves partially created. They have spread railways over the country and have weakened the strength of the legs on which in the old days we used to travel long distances, and we have had to pay for it both in export and passenger rates.

Then they have educated the Indians. Personally I am thankful for that education, as otherwise I could not have abused their civilisation in their civilised

country. All these things the British have done, but what they have not done was to have a proper respect and regard for our individuality as a nation. That is what is wanted. If this Congress is to bear any good fruit we must—I speak in all seriousness—get rid of the fear of the French Revolution—the French humanitarianism.

We must understand that nationalities constitute humanity, and if we destroy the spirit we destroy the concrete form through which the idea exists. It is necessary we should help to preserve the different types of nationality in the world.

In regard to India, my last word is this—the subject is very large and complex, and requires more time and thought than we are prepared to devote to it with a view to coming to a rational solution of the immense problem you have brought before yourselves and the world in the course of the last few days. I can assure you that in India the situation is very difficult. As one who knows the movement from the inside, as one who has been in the work, I can assure you that India is not dead, but India sleepeth, and it is not in the power of England or any other country to crush the civilisation and national spirit in India. India will come to her own, and it is for England and the civilised world to say whether she shall come to her own by peaceful, friendly, civilised methods, or by other than peaceful, civilised, friendly methods. Millions of people were not made to be bondmen of forty millions of foreigners. I and my people want a friendly settlement in the interests of humanity. We want the real thing, and not imitations; we do not want the English "reforms." The trouble will remain as long as the present situation continues. The people of India do not want any legal gifts or privileges or charters on paper which could be taken away the next day by another paper. They could not say: "The Lord gave, and the Lord taketh away: blessed be the name of the Lord." That was not what they wanted; they wanted to be let alone. The

people recognise the British position as *de facto* rulers, but the British must not encroach upon primary rights of organisation, of association or freedom of speech or freedom of activity within the limits of the ordinary laws of the land.

Mr. Taha-el-abd.

Representing Egypt, instead of M. Farid Bey, who had been called to Paris on important business, the speaker described the Egyptian movement, what is its aim, and what are its causes. He pointed out that history showed that what was considered right to-day was often considered wrong to-morrow, and *vice versâ*. So it was with the Egyptian movement, which meant the very existence of the Egyptians and the meaning of their lives. The Egyptian cause was a struggle for freedom and rights. The Egyptians were just beginning to enjoy their life's work, to combine, to unite, and love one another when one day came great England, not to defend them, but to crush their liberty. But it was quite another thing the English said they would do. They said they would give self-government, because it was better for the people to manage their own affairs, but instead of doing that they crushed the noble souls who had fought against the despotic rule of the Egyptian throne.

Dr. Rutherford had said there was a sad side to nationality, but there was no sad side to nationality if it went the right way. Dr. Rutherford said it was for the representatives of the nations to express what they wanted, and then give it to them. Well, Egypt wanted to obtain the very reason for existence—freedom, liberty, and humanity. He only asked for one thing, and that was that England should be prevented from sowing the seed of anarchy and revolution in Egypt. That was what he came there to ask the English nation. The English nation and humanity had been shocked at the Denchawaï affair. Many Denchawaïs had happened in

Egypt, for the British were undermining the Egyptians and driving them into revolution. But they were not going to be driven into it before they were ready.

Let me tell you of an irrigation inspector who found a man trespassing on some land. Instead of proceeding according to the laws, the inspector fired his revolver at the man. How could they expect Egyptians to respect the laws if the makers of the laws did not respect them? The English had failed to crush the Nationalist spirit in Egypt, which was growing stronger every day, and neither the English nor any other people could crush their work. Having failed to crush that work, the Government were now sowing seeds of revolution. All the Egyptians asked was that England should be prevented from doing evil in Egypt and to the Egyptian people. They only asked to have the rights they had before the English came, and to be left alone to enjoy those rights in their own way, to enjoy their old liberties.

As to finance, if there was any fear about that then as long as Egypt was indebted to Europe let Europe have control of the Cazalet as they had before Lord Cromer crushed the law. The finance business could be settled as well as any other international question. But he pleaded with England to stop present administrative measures, which were sowing the seeds of revolution in the country and operating not only against the interests of the Egyptians but also against the interests of humanity.

Mr. R. B. Cunninghame Graham.

I will be brief. We have heard speeches from people competent to deal with the various sectional parts of the subject. I will now, with your leave, go back to the main basis of the Conference, which really is, Imperialism: its Cause and Cure. The microbe of Imperialism is one of the most insidious in its approach in the whole history of pathology. In the same way

that a man takes diseases, scarcely knowing how, or when, or from whom, so does Imperialism attack a nation and sap its vitality almost unknown to the nation itself.

We have seen in the past the decadence of the Roman Empire, mainly through the spread of Imperialism. We have seen the decay of the great Spanish Empire in the New World through its inordinate expansion and through its inordinate Imperialism. It sapped the vitality of both these Empires by allowing them to spend force in the uttermost portions of the earth—force which they should have kept for the consideration of their own questions in their own countries for the solution of those great social problems to which we Socialists here in England and throughout Europe are addressing ourselves.

Much has been said this evening about India. It would ill become me to speak about Imperialism in India after men so much better qualified than I am to speak on the subject have addressed you. But Imperialism in India is almost a typical case. It has run the same course in India, in the archetype that it is running to-day in South Africa, in Egypt, in the Congo, in the regions of Peru and Colombia, and wherever they are exploiting nations and peoples throughout the world. First in India we had the humble company of traders. Who would have thought from such very small beginnings so mighty a Upas tree as this British rule in India would have extended its baneful influence?

After the traders we had the natural disputes with the natives of the country. We sent our soldiers, some of them in those days giants, prepared to sacrifice all their blood, their lives, their treasure for what they considered was the benefit of humanity, the extension of civilisation, and the propagation of their faith and their empire throughout the world. Those men, those circumstances, produced a Lawrance, they produced a Mountstuart Elphinstone, they produced in a lesser

degree Lord Canning, and many another man who laboured according to his lights to administer justice and really to introduce civilisation in those countries.

But little by little, and all unknown to the governing classes, the insidious bacillus of Imperialism was step by step undermining the humanity and the noble ideals of this people. It has been well said by several on this platform that the danger of Imperialism is greater to the Imperialists than it is to the people who are governed. Take the case of India to-day, seething with discontent from the Punjab to the Cormandel Coast; take the influence of Government and Imperialism upon the quondam Radical, Lord Morley. Little by little we have seen him false to that principle which he has defended through a long life of usefulness. Who to-day is suppressing free meetings in India, who to-day is imprisoning citizens without trial, who to-day has called forth the indignant protests that electrified us from the lips of citizens of India; who but Lord Morley? Oh, the pity—the man who has denounced the aristocracy and the hereditary principle more strongly than any other statesman in our modern life.

It was the same with administrators under the old Spanish rule, with many of the men of whom civilisation could be proud, but their ideals, their pride, their nobility, were inevitably sapped by the same forces, by having to act as governors, as the nobility and the fine ideals of Lord Morley have been sapped by his having to apply the coercive *régime* to such a country as India.

We have also heard this evening much of Egypt. The last speaker has dwelt upon the necessity of conforming to the Egyptian ideals. It seems to me that if we do not conform to the Egyptian and the Indian ideals we run the risk in both those countries of Sicilian Vespers of enormous magnitude. I am not one of those people whom the word assassination terrifies. Some deeds are written in letters of gold, deeds which we Westerners reverence and hold in honour, and it

may be that the most timid constitutionalist of us all, if placed in the same circumstances as El Wardani was placed in Egypt, might have acted—I say *might* have acted—in a similar way. Of one thing I am certain, that no sophistry, no wheedling or cajoling of the governing Power, no distortion of the facts by a baneful and reptile Press (always ready to throw over the whole world and to back up tyranny and to say a word in favour of injustice) will ever make Egyptian Nationalists hold the name of El Wardani other than in such honour as that attaching to the name of the slayer of General Brobrikoff.

This Imperialism is making snobs and cowards of us all. It is sapping the vitality of all of us; we are all guilty of it; all those who do not raise a protest on platform, in pulpit, or by pen, in some ways, are guilty of the stain of it. Think what a mean thing it is—think what a little thing it is, the modern Imperialist ideal as embodied in its prototype, Ex-President Roosevelt. Think of the advice that he tendered a few weeks ago in Cairo to the Nationalist Party, and think of the meanness of the bacillus infecting without the knowledge of its infection; think of the meanness of a Secretary of Foreign Affairs in this country who was content and is content to shelter himself behind the extravagant impertinence of a perambulating Yankee.

Imperialism means the degradation of all ideals; Imperialism means a vast concourse of small men under the shadow of a great waving flag; it means the sending out of your soldiers to stamp out the liberties of other countries. It is from little nationalities that your great men come, and I put it to every sane man and to every sane woman in this assembly, whether after all, as Bruce said at Bannockburn, freedom is not a noble thing, and whether if an angel from heaven were to descend to-night and to propose to govern us for our benefit, whether in a short time the mildest of us would not become revolutionaries and the angel have turned into a devil.

I have been asked to propose my remedy. I have no remedy but that of common sense and to endeavour as far as lies in us to fit all these nations for self-government, and to help them to that particular form of self-government which they chose to select. And finally, as I hate the idea of empire, if it were necessary to break up the British and every other empire in the same way as it is proposed to break up the Poor Law system, I should do it, because empires and poor laws are the due complement of one another, and both of them are disgraces to humanity.

Mr. J. F. Green.

I have not as much to say as I thought I should have before this meeting began this evening, because you, sir, and the other speakers have said a great deal, practically all that I wanted to say, specially on the question of Imperialism. My friend Mr. Gavan Duffy started that note yesterday, pointing out that the intention of this Conference had not only been to assert the principle of nationality and the rights of nationalities, but to show that by doing so we are presenting the most effective instrument we could find to combat this modern commercial Imperialism. What I do want to say—the only thing really left to say—is this, I am sure my colleagues on the Committee will agree that the Conference has been more successful in the numbers that have attended it than we dared to hope. It was prepared at comparatively short notice; there were very few announcements in the Press, and yet we have had splendid and enthusiastic meetings.

But I do hope that the enthusiasm that has been displayed here to-night and on the other days of the Conference will not evaporate. I hope you will not simply go away stirred to enthusiasm by the magnificent speeches that you have heard during this Conference, but I want all of you, especially those who are speakers and writers, to keep this question alive. I firmly believe

there are many more people—thousands more than we dream of—in this country who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of Imperialism. But the difficulty is to get all these people, if we can get at them, to hear when we tell them the truth about what this Imperialism means.

Then I do firmly believe that it is not an idle hope, that we have not become so dull in this country that we cannot stir the people to revolt against this policy, and one of the ways, one of the best ways, is to stir up the democracy of the country to insist that they shall have the same say in foreign affairs that they have in home affairs. As you all know perfectly well, the ordinary English voter has to all intents and purposes no more say in the foreign policy of this country than he has in the affairs of the Russian Empire. Although we have got forms of democracy for home affairs, the British Cabinet for the time being can practically do as they please in foreign affairs. You know the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty, the Anglo-Russian Convention, and a thousand other instruments committing this country to most important responsibilities have been brought about by the Government, have been signed, sealed, and delivered in the name of the Sovereign of this country, and not until the whole thing is settled and cannot be recalled is the House of Commons allowed to say a word about it. I say that method has got to be stopped.

We have got to get this Imperialism by the throat and absolutely crush it for ever if we are to keep the liberties we have obtained, and if we are to get any more for the down-trodden of the earth. We have got to take it by the throat and insist that the people of this country shall control their relations with foreign countries, and one of the best ways to do that is to assert that not only every country, but every part of the British Empire, as well as England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales—England even, that poor little despised country, I want to put in a word for her—not only every

component part of the British Empire, but every part of the great Russian Empire and other overgrown empires—we have got to assert the right of each part to absolute autonomy and self-government, and not until then shall we get rid of empire and bring about the only great thing that is to take its place, the real universal Federation of a World of free self-governing nations.

M. René Claparède (Switzerland), whose speech was interpreted, observed that he had been struck with the great liberty which we give in this country to people who criticised it. It was quite a novel thing for him to see Englishmen sit quite patiently when their Government was being criticised by all kinds of people—by Egyptians, by Hindoos, and others. He could not imagine a similar state of things occurring on the Continent. If a Pole was to go to St. Petersburg and denounce the Government of Poland, or a Finn were to go to St. Petersburg and denounce the Russian administration of Finland, the Pole and the Finn would soon be torn to pieces by an infuriated and patriotic audience. Much the same sort of thing would happen in other countries, and offered a strange contrast to the proceedings at that Conference. He had been pleased to attend that Conference, and when he returned to Switzerland he would have very much pleasure in telling his countrymen what he had seen and heard in England.

The Chairman: Among the many races represented at that Conference there was one not represented, and that was the race of Zululand. Now I am grieved to tell you that the greatest friend and strongest champion of Zululand in this country, Mr. Francis Colenso, lies at the present time dangerously ill, and I will ask Mr. Nevinson to move a vote of sympathy and condolence with Mr. Colenso and his friends.

Mr. Nevinson: I do not at all wish to cast a vote of sadness over the end of this Conference which has been to me one of the most remarkably successful and

significant of the series of meetings that we have had in this capital city of ours for many years past, because it is a protest against the general feeling which has so unhappily for the last ten years pervaded our country. But I have just this task to perform. We have just heard that Mr. Francis Colenso is dying. He is the son, as you know, of the distinguished Bishop Colenso, who stood as the champion not only of Zululand, but also of all the native races in South Africa against every evil report, against every intrigue, that could be made against him by exploiters and Government. This Mr. Francis Colenso, who is now dying, took up the work of his father, and together with his sister, Miss Colenso, who has lately been so prominent, they have devoted their whole lives to the service of the natives in South Africa, and especially in Zululand. It was through their exertions last year and the year before last that an abominable scandal was brought to light and the doings of the South African colonists, especially in Natal were exposed—doings by which they imposed upon the Zulu people a war which they themselves had instigated, and brought into prison Dinizulu, the son of Cetewayo. And it was owing entirely to their devotion that Dinizulu was liberated, in spite of great opposition from Government as well as opposition from the people who wanted to grab Zululand for their own benefit. It was against that opposition that Miss Colenso and her brother, who is now dying, worked, I am glad to say, ultimately with success. I have been requested to call upon this meeting to express, as I am sure you will, your heartfelt sympathy with the Colenso family in the grief which is now hanging over them.

The motion was agreed to, the audience standing, and on the suggestion of the Chairman it was resolved to send the message by telegram.

Mr. Windus: I wanted to say a few words before we parted in the hope that the suggestion that I want

to make may bear fruit. First of all, I think that we should remember that liberty is one and indivisible. I am led to make that remark because I know that in this gathering there have been during the past few days members who are interested in all forms of liberty, liberty for the animals, liberty for the subject races of mankind, liberty for Ireland in the shape of Home Rule, liberty for women who want the vote, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot divide this question of the subject races from the whole question of liberty.

Now I am very concerned to find we are having what was prophesied ten years ago by so responsible a newspaper as the *Spectator*. We are having to-day that recrudescence of tyranny which that paper warned us against, and the proof is, that we are to-day met to discuss the affairs of no less than ten different countries which are subject to the iron heel of oppression. I think that is a very serious state of affairs. I think also we should be reminded of those words in one of the sacred books of the Christian religion: "The dark places of the earth are full of cruelty—that men live in darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." That leads us, I think, to a suggestion—at least, one of the remedies—we must have for this state of affairs. When we want light on a problem very often the light is sufficient to dispel the cruelty; publicity, therefore, is one of the things we must strive for, and I want to know whether it is not possible for this Conference before it parts to organise an International Intelligence Bureau, with correspondents in every part of the world who will keep headquarters posted in all matters which appertain to the respective countries. I think possibly we might do some good in that way. That is one of the things I want to suggest.

I also want to ask you to notice the family likeness there is in tyranny all the world over. I want to ask you to note that we cannot afford to allow tyranny

and oppression in the Congo or in Russia because of the demoralising effect that these have on ourselves. Will you please note that the cases of India and of Russia to-day are strictly parallel—the only difference being that up-to-date we are not having to cope with the flogging in the prisons of India, but that is the only circumstance which I can notice which is absent from the British administration in India that we have in Russia.

Then, sir, I would suggest that here in England we ought at least to strive for the point that has been so well emphasised by Mr. Green, the democratising of our Foreign Office. It seems to me, sir, simply a scandal that we, a liberty-loving people, a supposedly self-governing people, have not the right to review a treaty before it is finally signed between two nations, and I think, too, that possibly for Englishmen we ought to consider whether we cannot extend the system of Departmental Committees for the great offices of the House of Commons. I think that too much power, perhaps, is lodged in the hands of our great government chiefs, and I think that Departmental Committees might serve useful ends in an advisory capacity. I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity of putting forward these suggestions. We should have this bureau of intelligence, and we should also have as soon as we can an organ of news, an organ of public opinion, either weekly or quarterly as the case may be.

The Chairman: Before putting the resolution, perhaps you will allow me to express the feeling which I think we all entertain, that it has been a very inspiring experience for us to come here and listen to the speeches of many representatives of subject nationalities and finding in them the same fine breath of freedom, the same demand for the common elements of justice, the same insistence upon the right of themselves and their countrymen to administer their own country

for the benefit of their countrymen in their own manner.

I could have desired that we had had a fuller opportunity than we have had to discuss what I may be allowed to call the more practical aspects of the proposed remedies, that is to say, that we should have had an opportunity of considering more in detail how it might be possible to assist in building up an International Tribunal which we must admit would be essential to the solution of this problem. For although from the standpoint of the individual Nationalist looking at the problem in his own country, it may be sufficient to say, "You leave us alone," or "You govern us as you like, we will settle the question of Nationalism for ourselves when the time comes." That, I say, may be a legitimate standpoint for the individual in considering the question from his own national standpoint, but we have got here as a Congress to take the broader standpoint and the international standpoint and consider what relations we ought to seek to establish between, not one nation and its dependents, but between the nations and another nation in regard to the government of dependent nations by that other nation.

We have got a right, in other words, to protest against a crime committed against civilisation by a stronger nation, either ourselves or another, and it is the right of organising that protest which we ought to consider in more practical detail than we have had the opportunity of doing. I am glad to see that one or two of the later speakers did approach the question from the standpoint of a democratised Foreign Office in order that we might put, for instance, in this country, our foreign policy, at least, upon as popular a footing of control as it is put in Germany; that is not saying very much, but upon this issue of government we are behind the Government of Germany. However, it is far too late for me to attempt to fill in omissions, great or small, which we may have committed, and with

your permission I will close the Congress by reading the resolution and by asking you to endorse it in the usual manner.

The Chairman having read the resolution moved by Mr. Chesterton,

A DELEGATE asked leave to move an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN said it was too late to consider amendments. If it had been sent up earlier it might have been arranged to consider it, and as the resolution had actually been put amendments could not be entertained.

Another DELEGATE asked if anything was to be done in regard to the suggested organisation, and suggested that those willing to assist should send in their names to the secretary. The representatives of all the races present could form themselves into an international body with the object of working and combining to take collective action when the time arrived to call the Conference together again.

The CHAIRMAN: This international organisation exists already. All you have to do is to express your desire to join it and to send in your name to the International Committee which has this matter under its consideration. Mrs. Dryhurst is at present acting as Hon. Secretary of the Committee at 40, Outer Temple, Strand.

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously amid applause.

Mr. GREEN proposed a hearty vote of thanks to the Chairman for presiding, and coupled with the vote the name of Mrs. Dryhurst. They had heard the eloquent way Mr. Hobson had spoken and seen the able way in which he had conducted the proceedings, while all must realise the enormous amount of work Mrs. Dryhurst had had to put into the movement in order to bring together that large and representative Conference.

Dr. GARNETT seconded the proposition, and said no words of his were needed to commend it to the meeting. The brilliant address of the Chairman was an instruction and an inspiration to them all and they could congratulate themselves on a splendid oration rarely equalled in that city. They also warmly thanked Mrs. Dryhurst for her excellent services and successful work.

The motion was carried by acclamation, and

MRS. DRYHURST, acknowledging the compliment on behalf of the Chairman and herself, said the best way for those present to mark their interest was to join their Society. A minimum subscription of ten shillings entitled the subscriber to all publications and entry to Conferences. They really hoped that the movement would grow. An offer had been received from an American Society to co-operate in a Conference next year, and they would have to consider where it should be held—in London, she thought, because here they got the best audience and Press notice. If they had another Conference next year they certainly ought to have Korea represented at it, for men who could do as a Korean had done at the Hague when denied admission to the last so-called Peace Conference were entitled to help and recognition.

The proceedings here closed.

APPENDIX.

EGYPT.

Translation of Address by Mohamed Bey Farid.

I am very happy to speak in England and before an audience most of whom are English. Here I am freer than I would be in my poor country, Egypt, which is governed by a handful of Imperialists who do harm to the English nation, though they think they are helping her. I wish first of all to tell you that I address myself to the English nation, not because England is now occupying Egypt, but I speak to her as to a free nation just as I spoke to the French nation in my lectures in Paris and in Lyons, and as I would address any other civilised nation. We can never acknowledge the English occupation—we consider that it is illegitimate and only based on brutal force which now confers right. Your Government, urged by Imperialists and financiers, may claim its protectorate over Egypt, or might even annex it, yet its position from the point of view of international law would not be more legitimate. Force can never override right, and our right to the ownership of our native land where our ancestors are buried is based on indefeasible rights of which the protectorate or even the annexation cannot deprive us. Convinced of my rights, I speak out boldly because I am convinced that right will triumph one day, and that the interests of Great Britain will dispose her to seek friends and not enemies where her interests are concerned.

You all know, ladies and gentlemen, that England came to Egypt in 1882 in order to help the Khedive

Tewfik to suppress his rebel army and to put him back on his throne; she came as a friend; she did not declare war on the Egyptian nation, and therefore she cannot claim any of the rights of conquest.

She logically should have left after having dispersed the army of Arabi and accompanied Tewfik to Cairo. After the trial of Arabi and his chief supporters, England began at once to re-organise a new army, in which she reserved to herself the right of having half the regiments commanded by Englishmen. Then she took as a pretext for continuing her occupation the revolt of the Mahdi in the Soudan. You all know how the Imperialists sacrificed Gordon Pasha, and all the civil and military officials of the Soudan, by not relieving them soon enough, and how they compelled the Egyptian Government to evacuate the Soudan and to leave it a prey to complete anarchy. It was about this time that Lord Granville, Minister for Foreign Affairs, sent to Sir Evelyn Baring the too celebrated despatch in which he said that Egyptian Ministers must either follow the advice given by England or resign. The late Cherif Pasha, the Prime Minister, resigned so that he should not have to sign the order to evacuate the Soudan. The frontier of Egypt was fixed at Wadi Halfa, and the Imperialists argued that as the Mahdi was so near, the British troops must remain in Egypt to defend that country against a chimerical invasion from the south.

Meanwhile Englishmen had managed to get into all the Government offices. Mr. Dunlop went to the Ministry of Education, Mr. Settle to that of the Interior, Mr. Scott to that of Justice. The latter, owing to the opposition of the Minister Riaz Pasha, was at first only appointed for a year. Till the death of Tewfik Pasha on January 8th, 1892, all went well for Englishmen in Egypt. The late Khedive offered no resistance; he suffered in silence, and only complained to his intimate friends, as he often did to my late father.

He acknowledged that he had committed an irretrievable fault in throwing himself into the arms of England, and he bitterly repented having done so. May he rest in peace, and may God in His mercy forgive him.

The present Khedive, Abbas Hilmi II., was recalled from the Theresianum at Vienna, where he was studying, to succeed his father. He was barely eighteen, and just of age. He was young, liberal, and had all the ardour and zeal of his age.

Egypt began to breathe again, and saw in him the beginning of a new era. All patriots recognised him as their expected chief, the man who was to give back liberty to his country.

This agreement between the Khedive and his nation was not pleasing to Lord Cromer, who, used to the resigned submission of Tewfik, tried to find a way in order to make him feel the heavy hand of a despotic guardian. Twice he managed to snub His Highness in the eyes of Europe and of his own subjects.

The first time was when the Khedive, convinced that he was right, dismissed the Ministry of Mustafa Fahmy Pasha, who was too subservient to Lord Cromer, and appointed in his stead Hussein Fakhry Pasha. Lord Cromer was very angry, refused to recognise the new Ministry, ordered all English officials to do the same and not to go to their offices. It was a strike of English officials.

His Highness gave way, and Lord Cromer met him half way by appointing Riaz Pasha Prime Minister instead of Fakhry. Yet a short time afterwards Mustafa Fahmy again became a Minister, and finally he became Prime Minister as before.

The second time was when His Highness was reviewing the garrison of Wadi Halfa, and when he made some remarks to the Sirdar Kitchener Pasha about the dress of the soldiers. The Sirdar telegraphed to Lord Cromer and was ordered by him to resign if the Khedive did not retract his words. At the same time Lord

Cromer saw Riaz Pasha, who was then Prime Minister, and threatened to have the Khedive deposed if he did not apologise to the English officers who were in his service. Riaz Pasha believed these threats, and hastened to His Highness in Upper Egypt and advised him to grant England what was asked by Lord Cromer. The Khedive ended by yielding to force, and he issued from the town of Fayonne, where he was, an order of the day in which he praised the regiments which he had criticised a few days before.

After these two incidents, in which His Highness resisted but ended by giving way to force, hostilities still continued between him and Lord Cromer; it was not open war, but it was very bitter. His Lordship never let an occasion pass to make the Khedive feel that he was his ward and that the English agent was the real ruler of the country.

The National movement developed under this policy of oppression, and the hatred of the English was felt among all classes of the nation. The Khedive sympathised with the Nationalists, and tried to get his friends in England to take action. Some English Members of Parliament came to Egypt, studied the question on the spot, and supported the demands of His Highness and those of the Nationalist leader, the late Mustafa Kamel Pasha.

Lord Cromer took up a very lofty attitude; he threatened the Khedive and inspired English newspapers to compare him to a child playing with fire. He argued that England had to protect the nation against the Khedive, and that if the English troops were to retire he would return to the old customs of his ancestors. Therefore, according to him England had to play a new part, instead of protecting the throne against the rebels, she protected the nation against its Khedive.

The nation did not believe any of these fallacious pretexts which the Imperialists invented for their cause

in order to prolong the occupation for an indefinite period.

Lord Cromer was clumsy and brutal, and went on making mistakes. The last was that of Denchawai, where he roused up against his action the conscience of the civilised world. The English Government, in order to save appearances, kept him in Egypt for a few months longer, and then suggested that he should resign as his health was no longer good enough to enable him to endure the heavy burdens incidental to his position.

Sir Eldon Gorst was chosen as his successor, and it was said that this was done in conjunction with the Khedive. The new representative of Great Britain knew Egypt well; he had been for several years in the British Agency at Cairo, and had also served in the Ministeries of Finance and of the Interior. He knew Arabic and could talk with Egyptians without making use of interpreters, who often are either ignorant or untruthful. It was therefore hoped that he would understand what patriots wanted, and that he would help them to recover their constitutional Government. He began by being very deferential to the Khedive, on whom he called every day and to whom he gave back all the external signs of power. The English inspectors who went into the provinces and who neutralised the influence of the Mudirs, became more courteous and less arrogant when dealing with the native high official.

In November, 1908, the Ministry of Mustafa Fahmy Pasha, which Lord Cromer had compelled the Khedive to appoint, resigned, and His Highness was allowed a certain amount of freedom in choosing a new Prime Minister. Boutros Pasha Ghali was made Prime Minister, and three young pashas were chosen for the Ministries of the Interior, of Justice, and of Public Works. Many hopes were entertained concerning this new Ministry, most of whose members proclaimed

loudly their patriotic sentiments and their love for liberty, and hostile newspapers in Egypt said that they were Nationalists. It was therefore easy to believe that we should soon have a Constitution. This was the more readily believed because His Highness had formally received the petitions, which we had circulated, asking for a Constitution, and which had been signed by more than 50,000 persons. But we were cruelly deceived! Under the pretext that the newspapers had been imprudent, in May, 1909, an old Press law was revived by virtue of which newspapers were quite at the mercy of a Minister's whim.

Naturally we protested against this arbitrary measure. More or less violent speeches were made according to the character of the orators. The meetings were brutally dispersed, and some speakers were prosecuted for having criticised English officers and for having uttered seditious cries.

These repressive measures, however, produced the contrary effect from that which had been anticipated. The dissatisfaction increased, and the nation was not pleased to see the agreement between Sir Eldon Gorst and the Khedive and his Government. It was the old system of Lord Cromer's put in force by the Egyptian Government, which was nominally independent. In fact the new system was worse because up to a certain point Lord Cromer protected the nation against absolute power, whilst Sir Eldon Gorst gave the nation into the hands of an absolute ruler, for the Khedive was nominally the real master of the country. The Ministry began to be unpopular and a state of friction arose between the Khedive and the Egyptian nation. The Imperialists cried out and pretended that the country was on the eve of a revolution similar to that of Arabi Pasha, and that the British Army must be reinforced in order to protect the Khedive against his people, who were falling away from him.

Here was a new state of things. In 1888 the English

helped the Khedive to defeat the rebel army, in 1894, at the beginning of the Khedive's reign, they were protecting the people against his pretended despotism, which he would enforce if the English troops withdrew. Now they protected the Khedive and his dynasty against the nation, and prevented the nation becoming a rebel as in 1882.

If His Highness were to sympathise again with the nationalists, whom he now condemns as being too advanced and too precipitate, they would go back to the old story, and so on, *ad infinitum*.

After the unfortunate act of Wardani, followed by the acquittal of his pretended accomplices, and the rejection of the Suez Canal scheme by the General Assembly, the Imperialists wished to introduce a reign of terror into Egypt.

The Egyptian Government then proposed in a hurry several Bills which would (1) Render all offences under the Press Laws liable to be tried by the Court of Assize sitting without a jury; (2) Dismiss all pupils attending Government schools or elsewhere; (3) Punish the editors of the newspapers as well as the actual writers of the articles; (4) Punish anyone intending to commit a misdemeanour or a crime, even if no overt act had taken place. The Legislative Council threw out the Bills relating to the Press and modified the others so as to leave less power to the arbitrary action of the Government. Notwithstanding this, the Government discarded this advice and promulgated the laws on the very day when Sir Edward Grey was speaking against us in the House of Commons.

The nation received these new laws with its usual calmness and only protested by its newspapers. The European newspapers agreed with our protests that such laws were only necessary if there was a revolution.

The Imperialists wish to show that we are revolutionists, terrorists, or anarchists in order to justify the

British occupation and to deprive us of the little liberty which we still enjoy.

As far as I could I have protested in the European Press against these accusations, and I have denounced, as I do now, the schemes of the Imperialists.

England is strong enough to make her will known. Let her do it openly, without trying to persuade the world that we are fanatics and xenophobes. I denounce, ladies and gentlemen, these tricks which are not worthy of the great British nation, and which make her hated wherever they are put in practice.

It is not because an ardent patriot commits a crime of which he has paid the penalty that a whole nation should be accused of terrorism and anarchism. Political crimes are committed every day in Europe and in America without mankind being indignant. President McKinley in the United States, President Carnot in France, King Humbert in Italy, the Empress Elizabeth of Austria, King Carlos in Portugal were murdered by anarchists without other nations having ever thought of occupying their country or conquering it. You are strong in Egypt, where there is a docile Government, you should frankly and loyally make use of your rights. But I am sure that the English nation does not approve these Machiavellian practices, and that is why I am speaking to the noble and liberal English nation which only wants to be informed of this.

I am not going to denounce the occupation and to prove to you all the harm which the agents of the Imperialists have done to Egypt in the name of the English nation. I have already done this in my lectures in Paris and Lyons.

Nor do I propose to prove the nullity of the Treaty of the 19th of January, 1899, by which England has made herself the partner of Egypt in the Soudan. You all know that the Treaty is null and void and of no value from the point of view of international law. It is signed by the representatives of the Khedive, who

has not himself the power to cede a particle of territory which is intrusted to him, and of a suzerainty which is not his own.

It is still more null and void because it is between two parties of which one pretends to be the guardian of the other. It is as if a guardian made a ward give up to him some of his estates.

I have come here in the name of the Egyptian national party to recall to you the promises which were made in the name of the English nation to evacuate Egypt and to leave her to her own destinies and to prove to you that the honour of Great Britain is interested in this matter.

The Egyptian nation is calm, hardworking, and only wants to live at peace with other nations whose rights it will respect. We are neither fanatics nor xenophobes; we are patriots trying to free our country from all foreign interference, and we ask for the neutralisation of Egypt under the ægis of Europe with an international financial control in order to protect the interests of our creditors.

I appeal to all the Liberals of Great Britain, to the Members of Parliament not blinded by Imperialistic prejudices, to those who have helped the Russians to obtain constitutional government, and our Turkish fellow-citizens to consolidate theirs, and finally to all those who protest against the abolition of the privileges of Finland.

I ask them to urge our Khedive to give us back our Constitution and to prevail on their own Government not to prevent the Khedive's carrying out the promises which have been made in the name of the English nation.

Legislative Library
Ontario.
Dept.

THE TREATY RIGHTS OF GEORGIA.*

Translation of Speech by Mr. Michel Tseretheli.

You have just heard a speech from the representative of Finland, the last victim which Russia wishes to strike off the list of the civilised nations of Europe.

Unfortunately, Russian despotism has other victims such as Poland and Georgia. The representative of the great Polish nation which heralded the era of the emancipation of the modern world by giving Copernicus to Europe, that nation which was politically suppressed by three monsters, will tell you what this country has suffered from its oppressors.

I have the honour of speaking to you on behalf of the Georgian people, whose cause is at once so simple and at the same time so important from the point of international law. I only ask you to give me your attention for a few moments.

For nearly twenty centuries Georgia was an independent, Christian, and civilised kingdom. That nation fought during all that time for her liberty, her religion, and her independence. Worn out and tired by continual struggles it sought the alliance and the protection of its Christian neighbour, the Russian Empire. The treaty of alliance and of protection was made between the King of Georgia, Irakli II. and the Empress of all the Russias, Catherine II. in 1783. Thus for nearly eighteen centuries Georgia kept her flag flying, and if she ceded her sovereignty to the great Empire it was only that she might live in peace with all her neighbours.

* Translation somewhat abbreviated.

As to what took place, I will read you our petition which we addressed to the Hague Conference of 1907.†

As you have heard, our Ambassador at St. Petersburg protested strongly against the violation of the treaty and immediately left that capital. All our nation agreed with him, and Eastern Georgia flew to arms. But the Imperial troops inundated Georgia and occupied the country, definitely making it later on the base of operations in the conquest of the Caucasus, whereby a mortal blow has been dealt the political power of Persia and Turkey.

The Georgian people never accepted the situation and rebelled in 1804, in 1812, in 1830, in 1848, and in 1878. But these insurrections were brutally crushed by the Russian troops. The Georgians not only asked for their national autonomy but also for their rights as citizens.

The double character of our movement was clearly seen in 1904-5, when the whole nation wished for national autonomy and a democratic government. It was in full agreement with popular movements in Russia, in Poland, and in Finland. But once more it was crushed by the reaction which is now all-powerful in Russia. Georgia has been overrun by troops and is still a prey to the depredations of Cossacks.

The nation was in despair, and this is why we petitioned the Hague Conference in 1907. Our petition deeply impressed the members of that body, but they could not discuss it as it was not on the agenda.

Now we have resolved to place our case before the civilised world. We are sure that we shall thus influence public opinion in our favour.

In theory international law has declared all states to be equal. And this gives the same rights to Montenegro as to Russia, and we hope that a new conception of law will proclaim the equality of all nations.

† Full text of petition on pp. 166-171.

Already, in 1850, an Italian, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini, asserted that nations are the base from which states are derived. Europe has seen some of the results of his theory carried out in practice. The subject races of Turkey and Italy herself have obtained independence and have now all the rights according to international law.

You see here an example of a very interesting phenomenon. I represent the Georgian nation, which has only three million souls. Madame Malmberg attends here for Finland, which has about the same population, and on the same platform is a representative of a race of 250,000,000. We are all equal here, and we should all have the same rights.

We see here the birth of a new conception of international law which will give its protection to all nationalities, and thereby become the true defender of liberty and of peace, and thus organise Humanity—a possibility which Bluntschli, the great German international lawyer, foresaw and thought to be feasible.

Meanwhile it is on the solidarity and a common action of all oppressed nationalities that the restoration of their just rights will depend, and also the realisation of the great idea of liberty for all nations and the establishment of peaceful relations between them.

This Petition was distributed to the delegates assembled at the Hague Conference on June 26th, 1907. No public notice was taken of it, but a profound impression was produced by the statements contained in it.

[Reprinted from the original document presented to the Hague Conference in English and French.]

PETITION OF THE GEORGIAN PEOPLE TO THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE, 1907.

In the name of Justice and International Law, we citizens of Georgia, one of the oldest independent Christian Kingdoms, address ourselves to the civilised European nations,

in the persons of their delegates to the International Peace Conference at the Hague.

We are convinced that our voice will arouse your attention and sympathy, when we state our just and legal claims on the Russian Imperial Government for the loyal observation of an international treaty, concluded between the independent Kingdom of Georgia and the Russian Imperial Government, ratified by both parties, and systematically broken by the latter.

In the year 1783, August 20th, the King of Georgia, Irakli II., concluded a treaty with Empress Catherine II. of Russia, by which Georgia placed herself, voluntarily, under the protection of the Russian Empire. On her side, Empress Catherine II., in her own name and that of her successor, solemnly guaranteed the preservation of the national autonomous government of Georgia, national legislation, the independence of the Georgian Church, justice to the Georgian language, a national military system, and a Georgian coinage.

This treaty was ratified on September 30th of the same year, 1873, and its full text is included in volume XXI. of the Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire.

The twelfth article of this international, ratified treaty runs as follows :—

> " This treaty is concluded for ever; but, if it will be found necessary for mutual advantage to introduce some change in the treaty, these changes shall be made only with the consent of both parties."

Fifteen years later, in virtue of this twelfth article, *pourparlers* were opened between Emperor Paul I. of Russia and Irakli's successor, King George, on the subject of the revision of the treaty. It was agreed that the Kingdom of Georgia should form a part of the Russian Empire, preserving all the autonomous and national rights enumerated in the treaty of protectorate of 1783.

On January 18th, 1801, the manifesto of the Emperor Paul on the annexation of Georgia was posted up in the streets of St. Petersburg, in which he said :—

> " Hereby, We declare, on our Imperial Word, that on the union of the Kingdom of Georgia . . . all the rights and privileges . . . will be maintained in their entirety," etc., etc. (*Emperor Paul's Manifesto.*)

But the new treaty was never signed, as both King George and the Emperor Paul died shortly before its ratification.

Nevertheless, the successor of the Emperor Paul, Alexander I., in a manifesto dated Moscow, September 12th, 1801, proclaimed :—

"Ascending to the throne, We found the Kingdom of Georgia annexed to the Russian Empire, as was solemnly declared in the manifesto of January 18th, 1801."

The Georgian Ambassadors at the Russian Court protested against this declaration, and left St. Petersburg.

This manifesto of September 12th, 1801, of Alexander I., again confirmed the autonomy of Georgia in her elective home government; and the statutes of the Georgian home government, which were signed the same day, declared :—

"The General Assembly of the Supreme Georgian Government (consisting of four departments), by a majority of votes, decides governmental cases finally."

Though the autonomy of Georgia was confirmed, the Georgians have always considered the Emperor Alexander's manifesto illegal, and a violation of the treaty concluded with Catherine II., which guaranteed that any change in the treaty might be made only with the consent of both parties.

From that moment the Russian Government has acted systematically in violation of the terms of the treaty.

The elective Supreme Georgian Government was abolished gradually, and a Russian bureaucratic military order was imposed instead; and at present, in the high administration and in the council of the Viceroy, there is only one Georgian official—the interpreter.

During the last fifty years the Georgian language has been banished from the tribunals, and justice is done in Russian, a language unintelligible to the peasants and workers, who are thus deprived of the most elementary right of citizenship.

The Georgian language is excluded from all governmental, and even rural, administration, as well as from schools, and partly from the churches.

Our national military system, guaranteed by the treaty, has been replaced by Russian obligatory service; and our young men are always sent from our mild climate to serve in Northern Russia and Siberia, in consequence of which, the military doctors have stated, 47 per cent. of the Georgian soldiers die or are disabled through the inclemency of the climate.

The policy of enforced Russification has resulted in the economic ruin of our nation. Our Church, one of the most

ancient, independent Christian Churches, was deprived of her independence and possessions, simply by administrative order. Our historical buildings and cathedrals, many of them splendid specimens of mediæval architecture, and our Georgian works of art, were left to fall in ruin; and we have no means to restore them, because the revenue of our Church possessions, valued at 2,400,000 roubles a year, has been appropriated by the Russian Imperial Treasury. Furthermore, all Georgian national lands have been appropriated by the Russian Government and declared Russian State property. On these lands whole villages of Russian and other foreign colonisers have been settled by the Government. To each of the Russian settlers the Government allows thirty, forty, sixty, and sometimes one hundred acres; whilst the average Georgian peasant has only from three to five acres. In many Georgian provinces the Government has even prohibited the Georgian peasants from buying any land from these so-called Imperial possessions. Owing to this measure, the Georgian peasantry is suffering from a real "land famine," especially in the Western provinces, where, in some places, the price of one *dessiatine* (2.7 acres) is from £100 to £200, and our peasants are obliged to buy land by the square yard.

Except the abolition of serfdom, all the reforms introduced into Russia during the nineteenth century have been withheld from Georgia. Up to the present time we have not yet had trial by jury, nor zemstvos, nor elected justices of peace. A university and high schools have been systematically refused, though the Government has been repeatedly petitioned for them.

Even the newly-introduced constitutional *régime* is a sad irony for our nation, as the whole of Georgia, with its two million and a half of inhabitants, has only seven representatives in the State Duma.*

But, besides being deprived of our rights, another and even greater disaster has befallen our nation.

During the last two years Georgia has been kept in a state of siege, and delivered over to the horrors of military and Cossack brutality. Our flourishing provinces, Guria, Mingrelia, Imerethia, and Central Georgia have been burned and destroyed, gardens and vineyards deliberately laid waste,

* By order of the Tsar, the Russian electoral law was altered, reducing the number of Deputies for the whole of Russia, and the Georgian nation now sends only four representatives to the Russian Duma.

property (especially of peasants) damaged and looted. The towns Kutais, Osurgheti, Kvirila, Honi, Chiatura, and 104 villages were entirely or partly reduced to ashes and ruin. Hundreds of Georgians were killed, women and even children did not escape dishonour, as has been already stated in the appeal of the Georgian women to the women of civilised countries. The ruined and panic-stricken population fled to the mountains and forests, where many, especially young children, perished.

Even in Tiflis, our capital, under the eye of the Viceroy and high authorities, and with their consent, organised "pogroms" have taken place.

On August 29th (N.S. September 11th), on October 22nd (N.S. November 3rd), and on December 22nd, 1905 (N.S. January 3rd, 1906), women and children were massacred close to the Viceroy's Palace.

The systematic persecution of our nation has increased to such a degree that we have been prohibited from helping the people left in the ruined Western provinces.

When the Society of Georgian Women collected funds to assist the starving Gurian peasantry, the Viceroy, Count Varontsoff-Dashkoff, interposed, saying, "The Government cannot allow you to allay the suffering of those whom it has punished."

When in the spring of this year meningitis spread in Kakhetia, an Eastern province of Georgia, the Society of Georgian Women was again prohibited from sending medical help. Only a few weeks ago the same Society wanted to send vaccinators to Central Georgia to prevent the spreading of smallpox; again it was not permitted.

Hundreds, if not thousands, of Georgians are being kept in prison without any trial, waiting to be sent by administrative order into exile, to Siberia, or the North of Russia. During the last year over 300 men, mostly Georgians, were executed by military tribunals in the Caucasus. Thousands of peasants and workers have also been deported to Siberia and other Northern provinces. The European Press has made known the atrocious persecutions during the last two years in Russia generally. The independent Russian Press has stated that over 40,000 victims have fallen, and it is admitted that, next to the Baltic provinces, Georgia has suffered most.

Such humiliation and oppression have been unknown in our history since the time of Tamerlane's invasion.

And when we dare to raise our voice in defence of our national rights, when we dare to mention the international

treaty, we are arrested, persecuted, and often threatened with wholesale deportation and extermination.

In this unendurable condition, deprived of the right of collective petition to the Duma and the Tsar, the Georgian nation decides to bring before the civilised world her complaints of the illegal actions of the Russian Imperial Government, of the non-observance of an international treaty concluded in conformity with all the legal formalities adopted by civilised powers—a treaty which, on our side, never was broken.

By the action of Europe the oppressed, half-barbarous Turkish-Balkan provinces have been transformed into the constitutional, flourishing States of Servia, Roumania, and Bulgaria.

Our country, on the other hand, after centuries of independent political life and Christian civilisation, after uniting itself voluntarily to the Russian Empire in the hope of drawing nearer to civilised Europe, instead of gaining progress and peaceful development, is now ruined, our national, political, and intellectual life systematically crushed, and our aspirations pitilessly suppressed.

Such is the situation created by the Russian Imperial Government in contempt of all sacred engagements which we now lay before the powers of the civilised world united in a solemn conference, in order to obtain law and justice, in the hope that our cause, by arousing your sympathy, will ensure that our rights will be restored in conformity with the treaty of 1783, which guaranteed us the integrity of our territory and a national autonomy under the protectorate of the Russian Empire.

(Here follow the signatures.)

The original of this Petition in the Georgian language, with the signatures, is in the keeping of the English "Georgian Relief" Committee.

3, Adelphi Terrace, London.
June 18th, 1907.

TRANSLATION OF SPEECH

BY

MR. RENÉ CLAPARÈDE,

Hon. Sec. of the International League of the Congo, etc., etc.

Allow me first of all to congratulate the Committee which has organised this Conference. It is a good thing that those who are fighting in various countries in favour of the same cause, should get to know one another. I should only suggest that at the next Conference there should be fewer subjects on the agenda, so that discussion may take place. Free discussion is the very life of a congress.

The question which concerns us is a two-fold one. It is necessary to throw light on the real position of the black races. We must study the land question and that of forced labour. On the other hand we have to educate public opinion in our countries in order to arouse attention to these matters which are still rarely discussed. In this respect, our so-called civilised races are still in a barbarous state, for to accept without protest the crimes committed against civilisation is to be a barbarian.

The movement which, led by Mr. Morel, came from England, has spread to the United States, to Belgium, to France, to Switzerland, and to Germany. An International Committee has been formed to keep up friendly relations between these autonomous committees.

In Switzerland a League for the defence of the natives in the so-called Basin of the Congo was founded two years ago, having its office at Geneva; but the three vice-presidents live in the Cantons of Vaud, of Neuchâtel and of Basle—a very necessary measure of decentralisation for an inter-cantonal society. The League has about 450 members, but has recruited most of its members in the Protestant cantons, and very few in the Catholic ones.

From a moral point of view we have had a curious experience. Deep gratitude is due to those who have helped us in spite of almost incredible opposition. We may classify our opponents as follows :—

1. Those who deny that there are any outrages. These are chiefly old officials of the Congo who have come back to Switzerland. There are about one hundred Swiss officials there. They have seen nothing, and heard nothing. The Congo is an ordinary colony, and they say this in newspapers and in pamphlets.

Among those who deny we may note that Portuguese journalist who, writing about Angola, and referring to Mr. Nevinson, found nothing better to do than to deny his existence, and to say that he was a myth.

2. Those who say "These things always occur in Uganda, in Nigeria, in India," etc. It must be noted that cultured peeople say this.

3. Those who are mistrustful because the origin of the movement is English. They see interested motives in this campaign, the wish to make the Cape to Cairo railway, to annex the Congo, etc. It is astonishing to find how the old stereotyped phrases about "Perfidious Albion" are still quoted in countries friendly to England.

4. Those who say "things are exaggerated." They do not know that far from exaggerating, all that we say is less than the truth. The question of women, for example, has never been treated. We need another Mrs. Josephine Butler to dare to say how black women have been oppressed.

5. Conscious silence. For example, in the case of San Thomé, in spite of all articles written and of information given to buyers' leagues, the Swiss chocolate manufacturers have said nothing.

6. Those who make excuses for the system by giving philanthropic reasons by saying: "The blacks are happier than under the Arab slave trade, the system of ordeal and of human sacrifice." At San Thomé, for instance, one of the most important newspapers of Switzerland has said that the blacks are happier than in the hinterland of Angola.

7. The attitude of the Press. In Switzerland only a weekly newspaper, the *Signal,* of Geneva, has been fighting the cause of the blacks for more than four years. A few newspapers publish the articles or the letters which are sent to them, but others will not insert them. One newspaper refused to insert a letter, saying that the Congo was too far away.

The cleverness of our adversaries, as far as the Press is concerned, is very great. They have been able to win over the correspondents at Brussels of most of the great newspapers. This is a question of some delicacy, but our

Federation may be very useful in obtaining information relating to these correspondents, who should be unmasked.

8. We must also notice the indifference of the public, which is worse than all hostile attacks and machinations. The most scandalous thing is that the Christians are far behind the free thinkers in this respect.

This hostility and this indifference bring me to my concluding remarks. We must continue the struggle, on parallel lines, led by our fighting societies. On the one hand we must always obtain information up to date concerning the Congo and Angola. On the other hand we must educate public opinion.

Let us now note the adverse and encouraging signs. Among the former is the difficulty that the Belgian League has in finding a secretary, and the fact that the American Congo Reform Association is not very active. But we rejoice that 162 Members of the British Parliament have signed a memorial to Mr. Asquith, protesting against the theft of lands, and the scandalous delays in the pretended reforms of M. Renkin, also that in Germany a Congo Reform Association has been formed. Finally we may rejoice in this Conference, which co-ordinates our efforts.

England has kindled a torch which must not be allowed to go out. Let us continue the struggle against the hypocritical revival of slavery, and victory which is given to perseverance will crown our efforts.

NATIONALITIES AND SUBJECT RACES COMMITTEE.

Chairman: Professor L. T. Hobhouse.
Treasurer: S. H. Swinny.
Vice-Chairman: J. Fredk. Green.
Hon. Sec.: Mrs. N. F. Dryhurst, 40, Outer Temple, Strand, W.C.

Treasurer's Report and Financial Statement, 1907-1910.

The Committee was formed at an International Conference held at the Hague in August, 1907. It was then called the Subject Races International Committee, and consisted of representatives of seven constituent societies, the Anti-Slavery Society and the Aborigines' Protection Society, since amalgamated, the Egyptian Committee, the Friends of Russian Freedom, the Georgian Relief Committee, the National Council of Ireland, the International Arbitration and Peace Association, and the Positivist Society. To these, there have been added, La Société des Amis du Peuple Russe et des Peuples Annexés, L'Alliance pour des Droits des Nations, and the Anti-Imperialist League (U.S.A.). Its purpose is to maintain the principle of Nationality, to claim for each nation the management of its own internal affairs, to protect subject races from oppression and exploitation. Outside the very wide range of subjects included in the Defence of Nationalities and subject races, the Committee takes no part, and it maintains a strict neutrality between the various sections into which the National Party in any country may be divided.

During the three years of its existence the Committee has made many protests in defence of the principle of Nationality or against oppression by dominant powers; it has sent a delegate to the Egyptian Congresses at Geneva and Brussels; it has been represented at the Peace Congresses held in Cardiff, Leicester, and Stockholm, endeavouring—in the two latter cases successfully—to bring the condemnation of international injustice and racial oppression within the scope of the Peace Movement; and the Hon. Secretary has carried on a very large correspondence with the defenders

of nationality in many lands. But the chief work of the Committee has been the organisation of the International Conference held in Caxton Hall, on June 28th, 29th, 30th. of this year. There were five meetings, the chairmen being —Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Ponsonby, M.P., Mr. Cunninghame-Graham, Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., and Mr. J. A. Hobson. Representatives came from Finland, Poland, Georgia, Ireland, India, and Egypt; and the condition of the Indians on the Amazon, the Yaquis in Mexico, and the African Negroes was dealt with at a special meeting. Professor Gilbert Murray gave the opening address, and amongst others who spoke were Mr. G. K. Chesterton, Heer Van Kol (Holland), M. Claparède (Geneva), and Mr. Bernard Temple, who represented Persia. The meetings were large and enthusiastic. In two ways, the wide range of subjects was seen to be an advantage. First, by protesting against national subjection everywhere, the question was raised above all national jealousies or racial hatreds. Those who pleaded at once the claims of Finland, Persia, and Egypt, could not be accused of any special animosity to Russia or to England. Secondly, the union of these kindred subjects meant the success of the meetings. Those who have had such matters at heart know how difficult it is to get together a good audience when the subject is India, or Poland, or Forced Labour. But that which for any one has proved almost impossible was accomplished for all together.

The Financial Statement, audited by Mr. Windus, Chartered Accountant, and presented herewith, covers the period from October, 1907, when the accounts of the Hague Conference were closed, and Mr. Nevinson resigned the Treasurership, to July, 1910. It will be seen that the cost of the London Conference lasting three days, with five meetings, was slightly over £35. Subscribers, therefore, have some assurance that the funds of the Committee are carefully expended. Those who subscribe ten shillings or more are entitled to all publications issued. The Committee appeal for assistance to all who approve of their work, which, with greater resources, could be much extended.

Subscriptions should be sent to—

S. H. Swinny, *Hon. Treasurer,*

5, Palace Mansions, 101, Lambeth Road,
London, S. E.

September 20th, 1910.

Financial Statement for the period from the close of the Conference at the Hague to the close of the Conference in London, 1907-1910.

RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
Outstanding Delegation Fees, Hague Conference, 1907	3	0	0
Subscriptions from Constituent Societies	27	19	8
Donation, 1908	1	0	0
Special Donations for Expenses of London Conference, 1910	20	6	0
Amount due to Hon. Treasurer	0	6	5
	£52	12	1

PAYMENTS.

	£	s.	d.
Printing	2	5	0
Typewriting	0	12	5
Postage and Stationery	1	0	0
Delegate's Ticket, Cardiff Peace Congress, 1908	0	9	6
Delegate's Expenses, Egyptian Congress at Geneva, September, 1909	8	18	10
Delegate's Ticket, Leicester Peace Congress, 1910	0	2	6
Use of Office at 40, Outer Temple—8 months to July, 1910	4	0	0
Expenses of the London Conference, June, 1910—			
Rent of Caxton Hall (£ 16 5 6)			
Printing (£ 9 1 9)			
Advertising (£ 5 5 0)			
Postage, Telegrams, and Stationery (£ 3 7 3)			
Tea for Foreign Delegates, Speakers, Press (June 29th) (£ 0 15 0)			
Sundries (£ 0 9 4)			
	35	3	10
	£52	12	1

S. H. SWINNY, *Hon. Treasurer.*
N. F. DRYHURST, *Hon. Secretary.*

July 15th, 1910.

P.T.O.

The above statement of Receipts and Payments has been compared with the Vouchers by the undersigned and found correct.

A. J. WINDUS, *Chartered Accountant*,
30, Moorgate Street, London, E.C.

August 1st, 1910.

GARDEN CITY PRESS LIMITED, PRINTERS, LETCHWORTH, HERTS.

IN THE PRESS.

Royal 8vo. 500 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

An Edition in French will be published in the same style and at the same price as the English.

UNIVERSAL RACES CONGRESS.

The Volume containing the Papers to be read at this Conference, to be held under the auspices of the Royal University of London, on the 26th-29th July, 1910, will be published by P. S. KING & SON, ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, immediately after the Conference.

LIST OF PAPERS CONTAINED IN THE VOLUME:

FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Meaning of Race, Tribe and Nation. Brajendranath Seal, M.A., Ph.D.
Anthropological View of Race. Dr. Felix V. Luschan.
Sociological View of Race. Professor Alfred Fouillee.
The Problem of Race Equality. G. Spiller, London, Hon. Organiser of the Congress.

CONDITIONS OF PROGRESS (General Problems).

The Rationale of Autonomy. John M. Robertson, M.P.
Influence of Geographical, Economic, and Political Conditions. Dr. P. S. Reinsch.
Language as a Consolidating and Separating Influence. D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt.
Religion as a Consolidating and Separating Influence. T. W. Rhys Davids, LL.D., Ph.D.
Differences in Customs and Morals and their Resistance to Rapid Change. Dr. Guiseppe Sergi, Hon. F.R.A.I.
Intellectual Standing of Different Races and their Respective Opportunities for Culture. Charles S. Myers, M.A., M.D., Sc.D.
The Present Position of Women. Sister Nivedita (Miss Margaret Noble).
The Instability of Physical Types. Dr. Franz Boas,
Climatic Control of Skin-Colour. Lionel W. Lyde.
Inter-racial Marriage. Professor Earl E. Finch, Wilberforce, Ohio, U.S.A.

CONDITIONS OF PROGRESS (Special Problems).

Tendencies towards Parliamentary Rule. Dr. Christian L. Lange.
China. His Excellency Wu-Ting-Fang.
Japan. Tongo Takebe, and Teruaki Kobayashi.
Persia. M. Hadji Mirza Yahza.
The Bahai Movement. His Excellency Abdul Baha Abbas (Abbas Effendi).
East and West in India. The Hon. G. K. Gokhale, C.I.E.
Egypt. Moh. Sourour Bey, Mixed Court of Appeal of Cairo.
Hayti. General Legitime.
Hungary. Dr. Akas de Timon.
The Rôle of Russia in bringing together West and East. Dr. Alexander Yastchenko.

PEACEFUL CONTACT BETWEEN CIVILISATIONS.

Science and Art, Literature and the Press. Dr. Ferdinand Tonnies.
The Work done by Private Initiative in the Organisation of the World. M. H. La Fontaine.
The International Institute of Agriculture (at Rome). David Lubin.
The Batak Institute at Leyden. Dr. A. W. Nieuwenhuis.
International Laws, Treaties, Hague Conferences, Hague Court. Dr. Walter Schucking.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN INTER-RACIAL ECONOMICS.

Investments and Loans. Dr. A. de Navratil.
Wages and Emigration. Frederick C. Croxton, and Professor W. Jett Lauck.
Opening of Markets and Countries. John A. Hobson, M.A.

THE MODERN CONSCIENCE IN RELATION TO RACIAL QUESTIONS.

The Fundamental Principle of Inter-Racial Ethics, and some Practical Applications of it. Dr. Felix Adler.
The Jewish Race. Israel Zangwill, B.A.
The Treatment of Dependent Peoples and Communities. Sir Charles Bruce, G.C.M.G., D.L., J.P.
The Government of Colonies and Dependencies. Sir Sydney Olivier, K.C.M.G.
The Influence of Missions. Rev. Alfred Caldecott, D.D., D.Litt.
Indentured Labour. (Paper prepared by the late) The Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., P.C., LL.M., M.P.
Supplement to above. Joseph Burtt.
Traffic in Intoxicants and Opium. Dr. J. H. Abendanon.

THE MODERN CONSCIENCE, Etc.
(The Negro and the American Indian).

The World Position of the Negro and Negroid. Sir Harry Johnston, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., D.Sc.
The South African Problem. J. Tengo Jabavu.
The West African Problem. Pastor Noyola Abgebi.
The Negro Race in the United States. W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, Ph.D.
Dr. Charles T. Walker.
John E. Mulholland.
The American Indian. Dr. Charles A. Eastman.
The Mixed Races of Brazil. Dr. Joao Baptiste de Lacerda.

POSITIVE SUGGESTIONS FOR PROMOTING INTER-RACIAL FRIENDLINESS.

The Respect due by the White Race to other Races. Baron d'Estournelles de Constant
An International Tribunal. Sir John Macdonell, C.B.
Regular Hague Conferences and Enlargement of their Scope. M. Leon Bourgeois, and M. Jarousse de Sillac.
The Press. Alfred H. Fried.
International Language. Dr. L. L. Zamenhof.
Ethical Teaching in Schools with regard to Races. J. S. Mackenzie, M.A., Litt.D.
The Cosmopolitan Club Movement. Louis P. Lochner.
The Organisation of a World Association for Encouraging Inter-Racial Good Will. Edwin D. Mead.

P. S. KING & SON,
ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER.

CATALOGUE OF PUBLICATIONS

ISSUED BY P. S. KING & SON

Africa. Slave Traffic in Portuguese Africa. An Account of Slavery and Slave Trading in Angola and of Slavery in the Islands of San Thome and Principe. By H. R. Fox-Bourne. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Africa. *See also* CAPE COLONY; CONGOLAND; EGYPT; *and* SOUTH AFRICA.

Agricultural Labourer. History of the English Agricultural Labourer. By Dr. W. Hasbach. Translated from the German into English. With a Preface by Sidney Webb, LL.B. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Agricultural Co-operation. By George Radford, M.A. Royal 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Agriculture. *See also* BOOKKEEPING; CO-OPERATION; CO-OPERATIVE FARMING; PEOPLE'S BANKS; SMALL HOLDERS; *and* VILLAGE BANKS.

Alcohol. *See* DRINK.

Anti-toxin Serum Treatment. *See* DIPHTHERIA.

Anti-Socialism. *See* NEWÆRA.

Arbitration. Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration. By Douglas Knoop, M.A. With a Preface by Professor S. J. Chapman. Cheap edition, cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Armaments and War, The Extinction in Perpetuity of. By A W. Alderson. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Assurance. The Assurance Companies Act, 1909. With the Rules and Orders made thereunder by the Board of Trade. With Notes. By Maurice Hawtrey Truelove, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Demy 8vo. 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Australia. A Colonial Autocracy. New South Wales under Governor Macquarie, 1810–1821. By Marion Phillips, B.A. (Melbourne), D.Sc. (Econ.), London. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Demy 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Bank of England, History of. By Professor A. Andréadès. Translated from the French into English. With a Preface by Professor H. S. Foxwell, M.A. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Banking. *See* CO-OPERATIVE BANKING; CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT HANDBOOK; PEOPLE'S BANKS; *and* VILLAGE BANKS.

Bibliography of Books on Social and Economic Subjects. *See* WHAT TO READ.

Bibliography of Social Science. The Monthly Journal of the International Institute of Social Bibliography. 2*s.* net. Annual Subscription, 24*s.* post free.

This contains the titles of all books dealing with theoretical and practical economics, sociology, and social conditions, the theory and practice of finance, industrial and social statistics, colonial problems, movements of population, and social history; (2) All the more important articles upon these subjects which appear in periodicals; (3) The Parliamentary Reports of the chief civilised countries; (4) Official documents and publications not printed for ordinary circulation, such as the reports and journals of learned societies, commercial institutions, and trade unions, &c.

Up to the present no such bibliography for subjects on social science has been published in England, and it should prove useful to those engaged in political, administrative, or philanthropic work, as well as to all interested in social and economic problems.

[The Publishers will be pleased to send a specimen copy to any address on receipt of the amount of the postage, 2*d.*]

Bookkeeping. By George Radford, M.A. Reprinted from "Our Land." 3*d.* net. (Inland postage ½*d.*)

Boys and Girls, The Early Training of. An Appeal to Working Women. By Ellice Hopkins. This booklet is specially intended for Mothers' Unions. Crown 8vo. 3*d.* net; 2*s.* per dozen. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Brassworkers of Berlin and of Birmingham: A Comparison. Joint Report by R. H. Best, W. J. Davis, and C. Perks, of Birmingham. Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*) (*See* GERMAN WORKMAN *and* HOW THE ENGLISH WORKMAN LIVES.)

Building Societies. By Sir Edward Brabrook, C.B., late Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies. A popular treatise advocating the Development and Extension of Building Societies on right lines. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Building Societies. *See also* THRIFT.

Canada. Self-Government in Canada and how it was Achieved: the Story of Lord Durham's Report. By F. Bradshaw, M.A., D.Sc. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Canada and the Empire. An Examination of Trade Preferences. By Hon. E. S. Montagu, M.P., and Bron Herbert (Lord Lucas). With a Preface by the Earl of Rosebery, K.G. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Canals and Traders. The Argument Pictorial, as applied to the Report of the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways. By Edwin A. Pratt, author of "British Canals: Is their Resuscitation Possible?" &c. Demy 8vo. 43 Illustrations and Maps. Paper, 1*s.* net. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Cape Colony for the Settler. An Account of its Urban and Rural Industries, their probable Future Development and Extension. By A. R. E. Burton, F.R.G.S. Issued by Order of the Government of the Cape Colony. Demy 8vo. Cloth, with Plates and Map, 2*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Case-Paper System. *See* POOR LAW.

Catalogue of Parliamentary Papers. *See* PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

Central (Unemployed) Body for London. *See* UNEMPLOYED.

Children's Care Committees. By Margaret Frere. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Children, Legislation in Regard to. Official Report of the Conference held on May 22 and 23, 1906, at the Guildhall, London, convened by the British Section of the International Congress for the Welfare and Protection of Children. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Children. *See also* BOYS AND GIRLS; INFANT, PARENT, AND STATE; INFANTILE MORTALITY; PHYSICAL CONDITION; MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS; *and* UNEMPLOYED.

China Imperial Maritime Customs. Reports on Trade, Medical Reports, and Reports on Special Subjects, such as Silk, Opium, Chinese Language, Music, &c. Issued by Authority of the Inspector-General of the China Imperial Maritime Customs. List sent, post free, on application.

China. *See also* OPIUM.

Colbert. *See* ECONOMIC POLICY OF COLBERT.

Coal, Foreign Trade in. By H. Stanley Jevons, M.A., B.Sc., F.S.S., Lecturer in Economics and Political Science. (In the Series of the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire.) Royal 8vo. 1*s.* net.

Colonies. *See* AFRICA; AUSTRALIA; CANADA; *and* INDIA.

Columbia University, New York. Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia University. List of these publications sent, post free, on application.

Commercial Gambling; Works by Charles William Smith:—

"ORIGINAL" THEORIES UPON DEPRESSION IN TRADE, AGRICULTURE, AND SILVER. Price 1*s.* (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

COMMERCIAL GAMBLING: the Principal Cause of Depression in Agriculture and Trade. Price 2*s.* (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

THE PRESS ON COMMERCIAL GAMBLING. Price 6*d.* (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

CHARLES W. SMITH'S "REPLY" to the Final Report of the British Royal Commission on Agriculture on the Question of "International Gambling in 'Fictitious' Produce and Silver, under the Option and Future Settlement Systems." Price 2*s.* (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

PRICE-FAMINES—THE RESULT OF "CORNERS." The Crime of the Century. Price 1*s.* (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

THE TRANSLATED EDITION OF "THE RUIN OF THE WORLD'S AGRICULTURE AND TRADE"—"International Fictitious Dealings in Futures of Agricultural Produce and Silver, with their Effect on Prices." By Dr. G. Rühland, of Berlin. Prefaced by C. W. Smith. Price 1*s.* 6*d.* (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

FREE TRADE AND PROTECTION under the International Option and Future Systems, 1846 to 1904. Price 2*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

THE ECONOMIC RUIN OF THE WORLD: International, Commercial, and Financial Gambling in Options and Futures (Marchés à Terme). Price 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

A MANIFESTO ON INTERNATIONAL, FINANCIAL, AND COMMERCIAL GAMBLING in Options and Futures (Marchés à Terme): The World's Greatest Perils. Price 6*d.* (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

A MANIFESTO ON INTERNATIONAL, FINANCIAL, AND COMMERCIAL GAMBLING in Options and Futures (Marchés à Terme) in conjunction with Free Trade and Protection. Price 1*s.* (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Commerce. *See* BANK OF ENGLAND; IRELAND; LONDON; LONDON MONEY MARKET; *and* RAILWAYS.

Commons, House of, and Taxation. By Archer Wilde. Demy 8vo. 6d. net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Communal and Individual Responsibility as Regards Health Conditions. By Mark H. Judge. Reprinted from the *Westminster Review*. Demy 8vo. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage ½*d*.)

Communal Currency, An Example of. The Facts about the Guernsey Market House. Compiled from original documents. By J. Theodore Harris, B.A. With an Introduction by Sidney Webb, LL.B. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Crown 8vo. Paper, 1*s*. net. Cloth, 1*s*. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 1½*d*.)

Consols, British, and French Rentes. By C. A. Stanuell. Demy 8vo. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 1*d*.)

Co-operation. International Co-operative Bibliography. Compiled and Edited by the Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s*. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 4*d*.)

Co-operation. International Co-operative Congress. Report of the Proceedings of the Seventh Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance held at Cremona on September 22–25, 1907. Demy 8vo. 3*s*. net. (Inland Postage 3*d*.)

Co-operation at Home and Abroad. An Account of the Co-operative Movement in Great Britain and other Countries. By C. R. Fay, B.A., D.Sc. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 10*s*. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 5*d*.)

Co-operation. *See also* AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATION; PEOPLE'S BANKS; *and* SMALL HOLDERS.

Co-operative Banking: Its Principles and Practice. With a Chapter on Co-operative Mortgage-Credit. By H. W. Wolff. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s*. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 5*d*.)

Co-operative Credit Banks: A help for the Labouring and Cultivating Classes. By H. W. Wolff. Crown 8vo. 6*d*. (Inland Postage 1*d*.)

Co-operative Credit Handbook. By H. W. Wolff. Crown 8vo. 1*s*. net. (Inland Postage 2*d*.)

Co-operative Farming. By W. Bulstrode. A Review of the Causes which have led to the Exodus of the Villagers to the Towns, and a Suggestion for a New Scheme on Commercial Principles. Crown 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

County Councils. What County Councils can do for the People. By W. Thompson. Demy 8vo, paper, 6*d.* net; cloth, 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Course of Average Prices of General Commodities, 1820–1907. Compiled by Augustus Sauerbeck, F.S.S. Royal 4to. With folding Diagram. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Danish Poor Relief System. *See* POOR LAW.

Democracy. *See* GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY; LIBERALISM; *and* SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

Diphtheria. Report of the Bacteriological Diagnosis, and the Anti-Toxin Serum Treatment of cases admitted to the Hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board during the years 1895–6. By G. Sims Woodhead, M.D. Foolscap. 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Drink. Case for Municipal Drink Trade. By Edward R. Pease. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net; paper, 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Drink. Temperance Reform in the United States. Compiled by A. W. Richardson. With coloured Map. 2*d.* (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Drink. *See also* NIGERIA.

Economic Policy of Colbert. By A. J. Sargent, M.A. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Education. A Short History of National Education in the United Kingdom. By T. Lloyd Humberstone, B.Sc. Demy 8vo. Illustrated. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

*

Legislative Library
Ontario
Dept.

Education. *See also* BOYS AND GIRLS; CHILDREN'S CARE COMMITTEES; MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS; *and* PHYSICAL CONDITION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Egypt. The Administration of Justice in Egypt. By H. R. Fox Bourne. Edited, with a Preface, by John M. Robertson, M.P. Demy 8vo, 72 pp. 6*d.* (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Elections. Practical Notes on the Management of Elections. By Ellis T. Powell, LL.B. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Royal 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Factory Legislation, History of. By B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, D.Sc. With a Preface by Sidney Webb, LL.B. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Second edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage, 4*d.*)

Farming. *See* AGRICULTURE; AGRICULTURAL LABOURER; *and* CO-OPERATIVE FARMING.

Feeble-minded. The Problem of the Feeble-minded. An Abstract of the Report of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded. With an Introduction by Sir Edward Fry, G.C.B., and Contributions by Sir Francis Galton, F.R.S., Rev. W. R. Inge, M.A., Professor A. C. Pigou, and Miss Mary Dendy. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage, 2*d.*)

Finance. *See also* BANKING; CONSOLS; LONDON; MONEY; *and* PUBLIC FINANCE.

Fiscal Fallacies. By Congreve Jackson. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Free Trade. Elements of the Fiscal Problem. By L. G. Chiozza-Money. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Free Trade. *See also* BRASSWORKERS; CANADA AND THE EMPIRE; COMMERCIAL GAMBLING; PROTECTION; *and* TARIFFS.

German Social Democracy. Six Lectures delivered at the London School of Economics. By the Hon. Bertrand Russell, B.A. With an Appendix on Social Democracy and Woman's Question in Germany, by Alys Russell, B.A. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

German Universities. A Review of Professor Paulsen's Work on the German University System. By Mabel Bode, Ph.D. With a Preface and Appendix. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

German Workman, The: A Study in National Efficiency. By William Harbutt Dawson. A Survey of German Social Legislation and Social Reform Institutions, as they affect the Working-classes. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*) *See* BRASS-WORKERS *and* WORKMEN.

Health. *See* COMMUNAL; HOUSING; INFANT, PARENT, AND STATE; INFANTILE MORTALITY; MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS; *and* SANITARY.

History. Select Documents Illustrating Mediæval and Modern History. A Text Book for use in Colleges and by all Students of History. By Emil Reich. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 21*s.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

History. *See also* AGRICULTURAL LABOURER; BANK OF ENGLAND; COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY; EDUCATION; FACTORY LEGISLATION; IRELAND; LONDON MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT; LORDS; PALEOGRAPHY; PHILANTHROPY; POOR LAW; *and* RATES.

Handbook to the Housing and Town Planning Act, 1909. By W. Thompson, author of "The Housing Handbook," "Housing Up-to-Date," and "What County Councils can do for the People." Demy 8vo, Paper covers, 1*s.* net. Cloth, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Housing and Town-Planning Act, 1909, The, as it Affects Rural Districts. By Annette Churton. Royal 8vo. 2*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Housing Handbook, Up-to-Date. A Practical Manual for the use of Officers, Members, and Committees of Local Authorities, and Social or Fiscal Reformers. By Alderman W. Thompson. Second edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth. Illustrated, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Housing. Public Health and Housing. The Influence of the Dwelling upon Health in Relation to the Changing Style of Habitation. Being the Milroy Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians. Revised and Enlarged. By J. F. J. Sykes, M.D., B.Sc. Crown 8vo. Cloth, Diagrams, 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

India Office and Government of India. List of the more important of these Publications sent post free, on application.

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration. By Douglas Knoop, M.A. With a Preface by Professor S. J. Chapman. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Industrial Conditions. *See* BRASSWORKERS; THE GERMAN WORKMAN; *and* WORKMEN.

Infantile Mortality. Report of the Proceedings of National Conference on Infantile Mortality, held at Caxton Hall, Westminster, on the 13th and 14th June, 1906. Demy 8vo. Limp cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Infantile Mortality. Report of the Proceedings of the Second National Conference on Infantile Mortality, held at Caxton Hall, Westminster, on the 23rd, 24th, and 25th March, 1908. Demy 8vo. Limp cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Infantile Mortality and Infants Milk Depôts. By G. F. McCleary, M.D., D.P.H. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Infant Mortality: Statistical Analysis of, and its Causes in the United Kingdom. By Helen M. Blagg. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Infant, Parent, and State. A Social Study and Review. By H. Llewellyn Heath, D P.H. With a Preface by Professor G. Sims Woodhead, M.D. Crown 8vo. Cloth, illustrated, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Insurance Against Unemployment. By D. F. Schloss. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Ireland. History of the Commercial and Financial Relations between England and Ireland. By Alice Effie Murray, D.Sc. Preface by W. A. S. Hewins, M.A. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Demy 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Ireland. Paraguay on Shannon: The Price of a Political Priesthood. By F. Hugh O'Donnell, M.A. Demy 8vo, cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Ireland. *See also* PRICE OF HOME RULE; *and* POLITICAL PRIESTS AND IRISH RUIN.

Land, Distribution of. By the Hon. Rollo Russell. Demy 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Land Values. Rating of Land Values. Notes on the Proposal to levy Rates in respect of Site Values. By Arthur Wilson Fox, C.B. Second edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Law of Prize on Land and Sea. By Dr. Hans Wehberg, of the University of Bonn. Translated from the German into English. With a Preface by John M. Robertson, M.P. [*In the Press.*

Liberalism. The Crisis of Liberalism. New Issues of Democracy. By J. A. Hobson. Demy 8vo. Cloth. 300 pp. 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Licensing. *See* DRINK.

Light Railways Procedure: Reports and Precedents. Vol. I. By J. Stewart Oxley, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 480 pages. 21*s.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Light Railways Procedure: Reports and Precedents. Vol. II. By J. Stewart Oxley, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, assisted by S. W. P. Beale, B.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Demy 8vo, cloth, 376 pages. 21*s.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Liquor Traffic. *See* DRINK; *and* NIGERIA.

Local Government. *See* COMMUNAL CURRENCY; HOUSING; LONDON MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT; NATIONAL AND LOCAL FINANCE; POOR LAW; TAXATION; *and* TOWN PLANNING.

Local Taxation in London. *See* LONDON.

London Building Act, Tribunal of Appeal under the. A Manual for Appellants. By Charles H. Love. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

London County Council. Messrs. P. S. King & Son are the publishers appointed for the sale of the reports and publications of the London County Council. Special catalogue, arranged under subjects, post free on application.

London Municipal Government. The History of a Great Reform, 1880–1888. By John Lloyd, Hon. Secretary and Secretary of the Municipal Reform League. Large quarto, 72 pp., 21 illustrations, handsomely bound in half blue calf. Special edition limited to 200 copies. Price £1 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

London. Local Taxation in London. By M. E. Lange. With a Preface by Lord Welby. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1½*d.*)

London: Mechanism of the City. An Analytical Survey of the Business Activities of the City of London. By Ellis T. Powell, LL.B. (Lond.), B.Sc., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. [*In the Press.*

London Pride and London Shame. By L. Cope Cornford. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Lords, House of, and Taxation. By Ernest E. Williams. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Lords, The. Their History and Powers, with Special Reference to Money Bills and the Veto. By Adrian Wontner, of Gray's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Lords. *See also* SUPREME SENATE.

Machine Drawing. A Text-book for Students preparing for Science Examinations in Technical and Evening Schools. By Alfred P. Hill. Demy 4to. Limp cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Medical Examination of Schools and Scholars. A Manual for School Doctors and Educationalists. A Symposium of Experts. Edited by T. N. Kelynack, M.D. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Money. A Corner in Gold and our Money Laws. An Argument against the Main Defects of our Money System. With a reprint of the speeches of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., in the House of Commons, 1844, on the Renewal of the Bank Charter and the State of the Law affecting Currency and Banking. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Money. The Rise of the London Money Market, 1640–1826. By W. Roosegaarde Bisschop, LL.D. With an Introduction by Prof. H. S. Foxwell, M.A. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Mothers' Unions. *See* BOYS AND GIRLS.

Motor Traction. The Locomotion Problem. By Charles Bright, F.R.S.E., M.I.E.E. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1½*d.*)

Municipal Manual. A Description of the Constitution and Functions of Urban Local Authorities. By A. E. Lauder. Crown 8vo, 3*s*. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 4*d*.)

Municipal. *See also* DRINK; HOUSING; RATES; TAXATION; *and* TOWN PLANNING.

National and Local Finance. A Review of the Relations between the Central and Local Authorities in England, France, Belgium, and Prussia during the Nineteenth Century. By J. Watson Grice, B.Sc. With a preface by Sidney Webb, LL.B. (In the Series of the London School of Economics). Demy 8vo. Cloth, 10*s*. 6*d*. net. (Inland Postage 5*d*.)

Nationalisation of Railways. *See* RAILWAYS.

Newæra. A Socialist Romance, with a Chapter on Vaccination. By EDWARD G. HERBERT, B.Sc. Demy 8vo. 6*s*. net. (Inland Postage 4*d*.)

Nigeria, Liquor Traffic in Southern. As set forth in the Report of the Government Committee of Inquiry, 1909. An Examination and a Reply. Published for the Native Races and the Liquor Traffic United Committee. Royal 8vo, 3*d*. net. (Inland Postage 1½*d*.)

Opium: International Opium Commission, Shanghai, February, 1909. Complete Official Report of Proceedings and Reports of Delegations. In 2 Vols. Volume I.—Report and Minutes of Proceedings. Volume II.—Reports of Delegations. F'cap. folio. About 500 pp. As containing the Findings of the Commission and the complete Reports of all the Delegations, these Volumes will be indispensable to all students of the subject. Price 10*s*. net. (Inland Postage 6*d*.)

Paleography. Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester. From the Fourth Year of the Episcopate of Peter des Roches, A.D. 1207–1208. By the Class in Paleography at the London School of Economics, under the supervision of Hubert Hall, F.S.A. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) F'cap folio, 15*s*. net. (Inland Postage 5*d*.)

Parliamentary Papers, 1801–1900, Catalogue of. A General Catalogue of the principal Reports and Papers published during the nineteenth century—also a few of earlier date—with prices, and in most cases analyses of contents. Printed with wide margins for convenience of librarians and others wishing to make notes, shelf, or reference numbers, &c. Medium 4to. Full buckram, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Parliamentary Papers, Monthly Catalogue of. Post free on application.

Peace. *See* WAR.

People's Banks: A Record of Social and Economic Success. By H. W. Wolff, author of "Co-operative Banking," "Agricultural Banks," &c. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 600 pages. 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Philanthropy. History of English Philanthropy, from the Dissolution of the Monasteries to the taking of the First Census. By B. Kirkman Gray. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Philanthropy. Philanthropy and the State, or Social Politics. By B. Kirkman Gray. Edited by Eleanor Kirkman Gray and B. L. Hutchins. A companion volume to "History of English Philanthropy," by the same author. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Physical Condition of School Children. Report on the Physical Condition of 1,400 School Children in the City of Edinburgh, together with some Account of their Homes and Surroundings. Prepared by a Committee of Edinburgh Citizens, and published for the Edinburgh Charity Organisation Society. Royal 4to, 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage, 5*d.*)

Political Priests and Irish Ruin. By F. H. O'Donnell, M.A., author of "A History of the Irish Parliamentary Party." A Second Edition, revised and brought up to date, of the author's previous work "Paraguay on Shannon." Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Political Socialism: A Remonstrance. A Collection of Papers by Members of the British Constitution Association, with Presidential Addresses by Lord Balfour of Burleigh and Lord Hugh Cecil. Edited by Mark H. Judge. Crown 8vo. Paper boards, 1*s.* net; cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Poor Law. Administrative Reform and the Local Government Board. By J. Theodore Dodd, M.A. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Poor Law. The English Poor Laws: their History, Principles, and Administration. Three Lectures delivered at the Women's University Settlement, Southwark. By Sophia Lonsdale. Third and revised edition. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Poor Law. The Danish Poor Relief System: an Example for England. By Edith Sellers. An account of the Poor Relief System as practised in Denmark, which is generally considered to be a model of its kind. Crown 8vo. Limp cloth, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Poor Law. Glimpses into the Abyss. By Mary Higgs. An account of the personal explorations undertaken by Mrs. Higgs, who, disguised as a tramp, has spent days and nights in tramp-wards, lodging-houses, and shelters. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Poor Law. History of the English Poor Law, 924–1853. In connection with the legislation and other circumstances affecting the condition of the people. By Sir George Nicholls, K.C.B. Revised edition, with a Biography and Portrait of the Author. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 7*d.*)

Poor Law. History of the English Poor Law, 1834–1898, By Thomas Mackay. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Poor Law. The History Sheet or Case-Paper System. A collection of Papers read at various Poor Law Conferences, with the Discussions thereon and Specimen Forms in use in various Unions. With an Introduction by Sir William Chance, Bart. Crown 8vo. Cloth back, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Poor Law. Memorandum on the Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws. By Sir Arthur Downes. Demy 8vo. 2*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Poor Law. Memorandum on the Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws. By Miss Octavia Hill. 1*d.* 7*s.* 6*d.* per 100 copies. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Poor Law. Our Treatment of the Poor. By Sir William Chance, Bart., M.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Poor Law: The Poor and Their Rights. How to Obtain them Under Existing Legislation. By J. Theodore Dodd, M.A., Guardian and Councillor for the City of Oxford. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Poor Law: Poor Law Reform, *viâ* Tertia. The Case for the Guardians. By Sir William Chance, Bart., M.A. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. Cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Poor Law. The Starting Point of Poor Law Reform. The Principles in Common, and at issue, in the Reports of the Poor Law Commission. By John H. Muirhead, M.A., LL.D. With an Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge, LL.D., F.R.S. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth back, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Poor Law. *See also* VAGRANCY.

Poor Law Conferences. Official Reports of the Proceedings of the Central and District Poor Law Conferences, containing the Papers read and the full Discussions thereon. Report of any single Conference, 1*s.*; all Conferences, each sent as soon as published, 10*s.* 6*d.* per annum; Bound Volume, with index, 12*s.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Poor Law Orders. Arranged and Annotated by H. Jenner-Fust, M.A. Second edition. Royal 8vo. 42*s.* net. (Inland Postage 6*d.*)

Poverty, Causes of. By Callaghan McCarthy, B.A. A graphic description of the parts and appearances of this planet—of its surface, its instruments of production, the items of property, its vegetable and animal life, its human communities, &c. The author brings all these vividly before the reader's mind, and explains the defects that give rise to human poverty. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2½*d.*)

Practical Notes on the Management of Elections. By Ellis T. Powell, LL.B. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Demy 8vo. Paper, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1½*d.*)

Price of Home Rule, The. By L. Cope Cornford. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 1*s.* net. Paper, 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Prices. Course of Average Prices of General Commodities, 1820–1907. Compiled by Augustus Sauerbeck, F.S.S. Royal 4to. With folding Diagram. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Production and Distribution. A History of the Theories of Production and Distribution in English Political Economy from 1776–1848. By Edwin Cannan, M.A., LL.D. Second edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Progress: Civil, Social, and Industrial. The Quarterly Magazine of the British Institute of Social Service. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Contains the Official Record of the National League for Physical Education and Improvement, and information regarding Foreign Social Activities, by Dr. Rodolphe Broda. A full list of all Publications on Social Topics, including Articles in Periodicals during the preceding quarter, forms an invaluable feature of each issue.

The Publishers will be pleased to send a specimen copy to any address on receipt of the amount of the postage.

Protection in Canada and Australasia. By C. H. Chomley, B.A., LL.B. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Protection in France. By H. O. Meredith, M.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Protection in Germany. A History of German Fiscal Policy during the Nineteenth Century. By William Harbutt Dawson. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Protection in the United States. A study of the origin and growth of the American Tariff System and its social and economic influences. By. A. Maurice Low. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Protection. *See also* CANADA AND THE EMPIRE; COMMERCIAL GAMBLING; FISCAL FALLACIES; FREE TRADE; SEVEN YEARS OF THE SUGAR CONVENTION; TARIFFS; *and* TARIFF REFORM.

Public Finance. The King's Revenue. An account of the Revenue and Taxes raised in the United Kingdom, with a short history of each Tax and Branch of the Revenue. By W. M. J. Williams. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Railways: The Railway Clerk's Assistant. By Geo. B. Lissenden. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Railway Trader's Guide, The. The Railway Trader's Guide to Forwarding, Receiving, Railway Charges, and all other Matters incidental to Transactions with the Railway Companies. By Geo. B. Lissenden. Royal 8vo. Cloth. 250 pp., including 48 pp. of Ready Reckoner, in addition to other tables and specimen forms. 7*s.* 6*d* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Railways. Monthly Bulletin of the International Railway Congress (English edition). Illustrated. Single numbers vary in price from 2*s.* to 6*s.* each. Subscription for 12 months, Jan.–Dec. only 24*s.*

Railways. Railways and Nationalisation. By Edwin A. Pratt. Crown 8vo. Cloth, *2s. 6d.* net. (Inland Postage *4d.*)

Railways. The Safety of British Railways; or Railway Accidents, how caused, and how prevented. By H. Raynar Wilson. Crown 8vo. Cloth, *3s. 6d.* net. (Inland Postage *3d.*)

Railways. *See also* LIGHT RAILWAYS.

Rates. History of Local Rates in England. By Edwin Cannan, M.A. A summary of the Development of one element of taxation. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Crown 8vo. Cloth, *2s. 6d.* net. (Inland Postage *3d.*)

Rates. Being the Revenue and Expenditure of Boroughs and Urban District Councils of 10,000 or more inhabitants (England and Wales) analysed and compared. By C. Ashmore Baker, A.M.I.E.E. F'cap. folio. Paper boards. *2s. 6d.* net. (Inland Postage *4d.*)

Rates. *See also* LONDON; MUNICIPAL; NATIONAL AND LOCAL FINANCE; *and* TAXATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Rating and Assessment in London. Quinquennial Valuation, 1910. A Guide for Officials and Ratepayers. With information as to the Principles upon which the Valuation is made, and as to how the Valuation is tested and in a Proper case reduced or otherwise adjusted. By Edwin Austin, of Gray's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2s. net. Paper, 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage *2d.*)

Rating of Land Values. *See* LAND VALUES.

Referendum. *See* LIBERALISM; *and* SWITZERLAND.

Sanitary Inspector's Guide. A Practical Treatise on the Public Health Act, 1875, and the Public Health Acts Amendment Act, 1890, so far as they affect the Inspector of Nuisances. By H. Lemmoin-Cannon. Crown 8vo. Cloth, *3s. 6d.* net. (Inland Postage *3d.*)

Schools, Medical Examination of. *See* MEDICAL.

Second Chamber. *See* LIBERALISM; LORDS; *and* SUPREME SENATE.

Seven Years of the Sugar Convention: 1903–1910. A Vindication of Mr. Chamberlain's Imperial and Commercial Policy. By Ralph T. Hinckes, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Sewage Works Analyses. An account of the methods of analysis in use in the laboratory of the Manchester Corporation sewage works. By Gilbert J. Fowler, F.I.C. Crown 8vo. Cloth, illustrated, 6s. net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Site Values. *See* LAND VALUES.

Small Holders: What they must do to succeed. With a chapter on the revival of country life. By Edwin A. Pratt. Crown 8vo. Cloth back, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Small Holdings. The Small Holdings Controversy. Ownership *v.* Tenancy. By Mrs. Roland Wilkins (L. Jebb). With a Prefatory Letter by Lord Carrington. Demy 8vo. 2*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Small Holdings in England. By Frederick Impey. Demy 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage, 1*d.*)

Social Democracy, New. A Study for the Times. By J. H. Harley, M.A., late Scholar of Mansfield College, Oxford; Vice-President of the National Union of Journalists. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Social Democracy. *See also* GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY; *and* LIBERALISM.

Socialism: Newæra: A Socialist Romance, with a Chapter on Vaccination. By Edward G. Herbert, B.Sc. Demy 8vo. 6*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Socialism. *See also* GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY; LIBERALISM; SOCIAL DEMOCRACY; *and* POLITICAL SOCIALISM.

Spencer. Herbert Spencer Refutes recent Misrepresentations. Professor Bourne's defamatory attacks met by excerpts culled from the Philosopher's works. By Alfred W. Tillett. Crown 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

State Railways. *See* RAILWAYS.

Statistics, An Elementary Manual of. By Arthur L. Bowley, M.A., F.S.S., Reader in Statistics in the University of London. Author of "Elements of Statistics," &c. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Statistics, Elements of. A Text Book for the use of students, actuaries, bankers, &c. By A. L. Bowley, M.A. Third and revised edition. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Demy 8vo. Cloth. Numerous Diagrams. 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Supreme Senate and a Strong Empire, A. By R. V. Wynne. F'cap. 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Switzerland, Referendum in. By M. Simon Deploige. With a letter on the Referendum in Belgium by M. J. van den Heuvel. Translated by C. P. Trevelyan, M.P., and edited with notes, introduction, bibliography and appendices by Lilian Tomn. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Crown 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Tariff Reform. The Manufacturer and the State. An Address by H. Hirst, M.I.E.E. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Tariff Reform. Fiscal Fallacies: A Comparison with Germany. By Congreve Jackson. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Tariff Reform, The Real Case for. Employment and Wages — How Free Trade "Blacklegs" Home Labour—Facts for Workmen by a Workman (T. Good). With a Preface by the Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Tariffs. Statistical Studies Relating to National Progress in Wealth and Trade since 1882 : A plea for further inquiry. By Arthur L. Bowley, M.A. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Tariffs. Tariff Commission Report. List of the volumes containing Report and Summary of Evidence, Evidence of Witnesses, Replies to Forms, Tables, and Diagrams Dealing with Iron, Steel, Textile, Agriculture, Engineering, Pottery, Glass, Sugar and Confectionery, post free on application.

Tariffs. The Tariff Problem. By Professor W. J. Ashley. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Tariffs. *See also* CANADA AND THE EMPIRE; COMMERCIAL GAMBLING; FREE TRADE; *and* PROTECTION.

Taxation. *See* COMMONS; FREE TRADE; LORDS; NATIONAL AND LOCAL FINANCE; PROTECTION; PUBLIC FINANCE; *and* TAXATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Taxation and Local Government. By J. C. Graham. Fourth Edition, revised and brought up-to-date. By M. D. Warmington. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Temperance. *See* DRINK.

Thrift, Approved Methods of. With a list of societies for its promotion. By Mrs. A. H. Johnson. Issued for the National Union of Women Workers of Great Britain and Ireland. Demy 8vo. 3*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Thrift, Institutions for. By Sir Edward Brabrook, C.B., F.S.A. A useful little book for members of working men's clubs, friendly societies, building societies, and other institutions of a similar nature. Crown 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Thrift Manual. A Manual on Thrift for the use of Teachers in Primary Schools. Demy 8vo. Limp cloth, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2½*d.*)

Thrift. *See also* BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Town Planning Powers. The Practical Application of Town Planning Powers. Report of a National Town Planning Conference arranged by the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, held at the Guildhall, London, on December 10, 1909. Papers and Speeches by Thomas Adams, J. W. Willis Bund, K.C., W. R. Davidge, H. V. Lanchester, A. R. Stenning, H. Inigo Triggs, Raymond Unwin, Paul Waterhouse, and Professors S. D. Adshead, Patrick Geddes, and Beresford Pite. Edited by Ewart G. Culpin. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2½*d.*)

Town Planning. *See also* HOUSING.

Trade Unions. Select Documents Illustrating the History of Trade Unionism. [1. The Tailoring Trade.] By F. W. Galton. With a Preface by Sidney Webb, LL.B. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4d.)

Tramps. *See* POOR LAW; UNEMPLOYED; VAGRANCY; *and* WHERE SHALL SHE LIVE?

Transport Facilities in the Mining and Industrial Districts of South Wales and Monmouthshire. Their future History and Development. By Clarence S. Howells, M.A. No. 2 of the Series of Publications of the Department of Economics and Political Science of the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire. Edited by H. Stanley Jevons, M.A., B.Sc. 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1½*d.*)

Unemployed: Central Body for London. Preliminary Report on the work of the Central (Unemployed) Body for London to May 12, 1906. Foolscap 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Second Report from May 12, 1906, to June 30, 1907. Foolscap. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Third Report of the Central Body, from July 1, 1907, to June 30, 1909. F'cap. 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 5*d.*)

Unemployed. Insurance Against Unemployment. By David F. Schloss. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Unemployed. The Labour Exchange in Relation to Boy and Girl Labour. By Frederick Keeling. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1½*d.*)

Unemployed. Report of a Temporary Colony at Garden City for Unemployed Workmen mainly from West Ham during February, March and April, 1905. Carried out by the Trinity College (Oxford) Settlement, Stratford, London. Demy 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Unemployed. The Unemployables. By Edmond Kelly, M.A. With a Preface by Sir William Chance, Bart., M.A. Contains a full account of the Swiss Labour Colonies in the Canton of Berne. Crown 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

Unemployed. The Unemployed: a National Question. By Percy Alden, M.A. With a Preface by Sir John Gorst, M.A. Second edition. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Unemployment and the Unemployed. A Bibliography. Prepared by F. Isabel Taylor, B.Sc., Formerly Senior Student-Assistant in the Library of the London School of Economics. With a Preface by Sidney Webb, LL.B. (In the Series of the London School of Economics.) Demy 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* net. Paper, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 2*d.*)

Unemployment. The Sun's Heat and Trade Activity as a Cause of Unemployment. By H. Stanley Jevons, M.A., B.Sc., F.S.S. Royal 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* net. Paper, 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage, 2*d.*)

Vaccination and Vivisection. Politics and Disease. By A. Goff and J. H. Levy. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Vagrancy. A Review of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy, 1906. With answers to certain criticisms. By Sir William Chance, Bart., M.A. Crown 8vo. 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage, 1*d.*)

Vagrancy. A Vicar as Vagrant. By Rev. G. Z. Edwards. With a Preface by the Rector of Birmingham. Demy 8vo. *2d.* (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Vagrancy Problem, The. The Case for Measures of Restraint for Vagrants, Loafers, and Unemployables; with a Study of Continental Detention Colonies and Labour Houses. By William Harbutt Dawson, author of "The German Workman." Crown 8vo. 5*s.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Village Banks. How to Start them; How to Work them; What the Rich may do to Help them, &c. By H. W. Wolff. Crown 8vo. 6*d.* (Inland Postage ½*d.*)

Vagrancy. *See also* POOR LAW; UNEMPLOYED; *and* WHERE SHALL SHE LIVE?

War. The Extinction in Perpetuity of Armaments and War. By A. W. Alderson. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

War. *See also* LAW OF PRIZE.

What County Councils can do for the People. By W. Thompson. Demy 8vo; paper, 6*d.*; cloth, 1*s.* (Inland Postage 1*d.*)

What to Read on Social and Economic Subjects. An Interleaved Bibliography. Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Where Shall She Live? The Homelessness of the Woman Worker. Written for the National Association for Women's Lodging Homes. By Mary Higgs and Edward E. Hayward, M.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net. Paper, 1*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 3*d.*)

Women. Educated Working Women. The Economic Position of Women Workers in the Middle Classes. By Clara E. Collet, M.A. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net; paper, 2*s.* net. (Inland Postage, 3*d.*)

Women. Women as Barmaids. Published for the Joint Committee on the Employment of Barmaids. With an Introduction by the Bishop of Southwark. Demy 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Inland Postage 1½*d.*)

Women. Women in the Printing Trades: A Sociological Study. Edited by J. R. Macdonald, M.P. With a Preface by Professor F. Y. Edgeworth. Demy 8vo. Cloth. Diagrams. 10*s.* 6*d.* net. (Inland Postage 4*d.*)

Workmen. How the English Workman Lives: Being the Experiences of a German Coal-miner in England. Translated by C. H. d'E. Leppington. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. (*See* BRASSWORKERS; *and* GERMAN WORKMAN.)

Messrs. P. S. KING & SON

make a speciality of Publications dealing with

ECONOMICS
SOCIAL QUESTIONS
POLITICS
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

and will at any time be pleased to consider, with a view to publication, any MSS. treating of these subjects which may be submitted to them.

* * *

MESSRS. KING & SON also make a prominent feature of Parliamentary Papers, and are often able to supply scarce and out-of-print Government Publications which are unobtainable elsewhere. Complete sets and various periods of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates are kept in stock.

LIBRARY
DEC
19
1980
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

HT
1505
C6
1910

Conference on the Defence of Nationalities and Subject Races, (1st 1910: London, England
Nationalities and subject races

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 12 11 10 09 005 6